

plan for needy families, so that a well-nourished America may produce for victory at peak strength; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

193. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Senate joint resolution No. 7 of the California State Legislature; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

194. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of Locale Italiana del Sarti da Uomo, No. 63, Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, concerning the Hobbs bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

195. By Mrs. SMITH of Maine: Petition of sundry citizens representing organization and dairymen who have direct interest in the welfare of dairying, especially as it affects Somerset County; to the Committee on Agriculture.

196. By Mr. ENGLEBRIGHT: Assembly joint resolution No. 10 of the California State Legislature; to the Committee on Agriculture.

197. Also, Senate Joint Resolution No. 10 of the California State Legislature; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

198. By Mr. RAMEY: Petition of A. F. Peirson and 30 other members of the Ottawa County National Farm Loan Association, of Ottawa County, Ohio, urging that Congress permanently reduce the rate of interest on Federal land bank and/or Land Bank Commissioner loans to 3½ percent; to the Committee on Agriculture.

199. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the secretary of the Convention of the Diocese of Ohio, Cleveland, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to representation of the religious conscience at the peace table; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

200. Also, petition of the executive secretary, Middletown Post, No. 218, the American Legion, Middletown, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to correction of the hindrances to the war effort; to the Committee on Labor.

## SENATE

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1943

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father God, we thank Thee that Thou hast formed our minds to seek Thee, our hearts to love Thee, and hast made our spirits restless for the rest that is alone in Thee. Since Thou hast set our feet on a path so full of chance and change that we know not what a day may bring forth, and hast curtailed every day with darkness and rounded our little life with sleep, grant that we may use with diligence the fleeting span of time vouchsafed to us, filling sunny hours with labor, working while it is called day, knowing that the night cometh when man's work is done.

Bowing now at this noonday shrine, may Thy name be hallowed, may our hearts be cleansed, and may our daily duties shine with the halo of a new glory.

"O healing peace of this withdrawing place!

O central calm that soothes storm-shaken men!

Refresh our fainting souls, but better still

Go with us to our tasks of life again."

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

## THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, February 25, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed without amendment the bill (S. 641) to amend section 6 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942 relating to the payment of rental allowances to certain officers.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) expressing to the national assembly and people of the Republic of Panama appreciation of their friendship for the United States.

The message further announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 839) to amend the act approved May 27, 1937 (ch. 269, 50 Stat. 208), by providing substitute and additional authority for the prevention of speculation in lands of the Columbia Basin project, and substitute and additional authority related to the settlement and development of the project, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. WHITE, Mr. ROBINSON of Utah, Mr. MURDOCK, Mr. SHORT, and Mr. ROCKWELL were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 82) to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

The message further announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

### ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bill and joint resolution, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 707. A bill to provide for the appointment of an additional Assistant Attorney General; and

H. J. Res. 82. Joint resolution to provide urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943.

### REPRESENTATION OF SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE ON BOARD OF VISITORS TO THE MILITARY ACADEMY

Mr. McKELLAR (for Mr. GLASS) presented a letter, which was read, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
Washington, D. C., March 1, 1943.

To the Senate:

By virtue of the authority vested in me by the act approved May 17, 1928, I hereby appoint Senators ELMER THOMAS and CARL HAYDEN to represent the Senate Appropriations Committee on the Board of Visitors to the United States Military Academy during the remainder of the first session of the Seventy-eighth Congress.

CARTER GLASS,  
Chairman, Senate Committee  
on Appropriations.

### JOINT STATEMENT BY SENATOR AUSTIN AND REPRESENTATIVE WADSWORTH ON PROPOSED NATIONAL WAR SERVICE ACT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, tomorrow at 10:30 a. m. the Committee on Military Affairs will commence public hearings on Senate bill 666. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, at this point, a joint statement by Representative WADSWORTH, who introduced the corresponding bill in the House of Representatives, and myself relating to what would be done if the proposed National War Service Act of 1943 were passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### WHAT THE AUSTIN-WADSWORTH BILL WOULD DO

It would provide for over-all organization and total mobilization of all our skills, and of our man and woman power.

It would make known the equal liability of all in the war effort.

It would enable Government to cure the evils of unbalance, hoarding, piracy, absenteeism, inadequate training for management and supervision, labor turn-over, and such shortages as those in agriculture.

It would remove the confusion now prevailing under coercion through orders and indirect sanctions.

It would substitute due process of law for Executive acts, thereby implementing the will of the people that, in this war, if any "mobile" person should refuse to perform his assigned duty, punishment could be applied only after conviction of an offense in our courts of justice.

It would stimulate moral power by voluntary methods to be employed when and so long as they are effective.

It would provide for selection and assignment of every man between the ages of 18 and 65 and every woman between the ages of 18 and 50, subject to reasonable exemptions and deferments.

It would erect safeguards for family life, for wage and hour laws, overtime pay, collective bargaining, mediation and arbitration, and other procedures for the settlement of labor controversies and questions.

It would preserve the right to join or not to join any union, where the person concerned is assigned to a job. It would not affect the status of a person entering employment without being assigned.

It would provide compensation to trainees during such training, and offer the opportunity of education for stepping up skills.

It would preserve reemployment, seniority rights, and rates of pay to the same extent as men in the armed services have such rights preserved.

It would keep, as the operating agency in making selections, the democratic Selective Service System. Such selection would be made under the designed direction of the War Manpower Commission.

It would provide for the mobilization and designed direction of willing workers who, left to themselves, would be unable to know where and how best to serve the Nation at war.

#### WHAT THE BILL DOES NOT DO

1. It does not put civilian enterprise or labor under military law or military control.
2. It does not break up families.
3. It does not form labor battalions.
4. It does not break up or abridge the freedom of anyone assigned to join or not to join a labor union.
5. It does not destroy reemployment and seniority rights.
6. It does not change the rate of compensation or the hours of service in any occupation to which anyone is assigned.
7. It does not discriminate between groups, such as agricultural workers and industrial workers.
8. It does not require service of a kind beyond one's abilities.
9. It does not make liable any woman who has living with her and under her care either a child or children under 18 years of age, or one or more other persons, who, on account of age or illness, needs her personal care, nor any pregnant woman.
10. It does not assign anyone to a location where reasonable housing accommodations for such person or his or her immediate family are not available.
11. It does not move people from place to place unless necessary to the war effort.
12. It does not establish a new principle or practice for democratic countries.
13. It does not abridge the sovereignty of the several States.
14. It does not destroy the democratic process.
15. It does not bring into question the patriotism or courage of the citizen.
16. It does not make any permanent change in our way of life.
17. It does not extend beyond May 1, 1945, and may be terminated before then by concurrent resolution of Congress.

Public hearings will begin March 2, 1943.

WARREN R. AUSTIN.

JAMES W. WADSWORTH.

#### ENDORSEMENT BY SECRETARY OF WAR OF PROPOSED NATIONAL SERVICE ACT

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, on February 26, the Secretary of War, Hon. Henry L. Stimson, made a report to Hon. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS, chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, on Senate bill 666, containing, among other statements, the following:

The War Department strongly endorses S. 666, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill to provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of selective war service with the aid of the Selective Service System and urges its prompt passage by the Congress.

I ask unanimous consent that the report submitted by the Secretary of War may be printed in the RECORD at this point.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WAR DEPARTMENT.

February 26, 1943.

HON. ROBERT R. REYNOLDS,  
Chairman, Committee on Military Affairs,  
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR REYNOLDS: The War Department strongly endorses S. 666, Seventy-eighth Congress, a bill to provide further for the successful prosecution of the war through a system of civilian selective war service with the aid of the Selective Service System and urges its prompt passage by the Congress. Comments on specific provisions of the bill will not be given at this time.

S. 666 would make every man who has registered or is required to register under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, and every woman between the ages of 18 and 50, with certain exceptions, who are required to register under this bill, liable to contribute by personal service to the war effort in a noncombatant capacity in industry, agriculture, or any other occupation, activity, or employment which the President shall from time to time determine to be essential to the effective prosecution of the war. The power to determine that such workers are needed is vested in the President. He may call for volunteers for service and, if the response is inadequate or if he deems it impracticable to call for volunteers, may, either directly or through the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission, direct the Selective Service System to supply the required number of persons. The Selective Service System would be maintained intact, and would be utilized as the agency to classify and select those persons to be assigned to service.

A total mobilization of our man and woman power is essential to win the war. Only through comprehensive legislation, such as S. 666, to place on everyone the equal obligation to serve in the war effort can a total mobilization be achieved.

Britain and Russia have national war service laws, under which men and women may be assigned to nonmilitary as well as military duties. Both Germany and Japan likewise have such laws. These countries are more fully mobilized than we are. We cannot wage war to the greatest advantage and with minimum losses, or contribute our full part to the united war effort, without mobilizing our human resources with a thoroughness at least approaching that of our enemies and our principal allies. Furthermore we owe an obligation to our fighting men to effect an extension of the Selective Service System to the home front to assure a steady, full supply of munitions and supplies necessary to win the war.

At this crucial stage of the war, we can no longer depend solely on voluntary methods backed by indirect sanctions to cure the growing critical labor shortages which threaten the war effort. There are labor shortages, present or imminent, in agriculture, mining, and industry. There is increasing evidence of the inadequacy of the present controls to achieve a full utilization of our manpower and to solve the labor shortage problem. As a result, in several instances where labor shortage emergencies existed, it has been necessary to take men from the Army to supply labor. This is a practice that is wasteful and disruptive to the Army's training program. As a further result, proposals have been made to give blanket deferments to groups of workers, thus limiting greatly the manpower pool on which the Army depends for its soldiers. We must direct additional labor into essential occupations rather than keep the men out of the Army who are needed for the job of winning the war.

S. 666 recognizes that if possible the problem of labor supply should be solved by voluntary methods. It provides for compulsion only when voluntary methods fail or are for other reasons inadequate.

Inasmuch as the committee has requested that this report be expedited, the Bureau of the Budget has authorized its submission without a determination by the Bureau as to whether it conforms to the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

HENRY L. STIMSON,  
Secretary of War.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

#### SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, TREASURY DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 8)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department, fiscal year 1943, amounting to \$4,000,000 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

#### AMENDMENT OF WORLD WAR VETERANS' ACT

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 301, World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to authorize renewal of expiring 5-year level premium term policies of those in active military or naval service and certain others outside the continental limits of the United States, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

#### DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of War (2) and Agriculture (2), Federal Works Agency, The National Archives, and Executive Office of the President (Office of War Information) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated.

#### By the VICE PRESIDENT:

A resolution of Local No. 358 (C. I. O.), of the United Grocery Store Employees Union, Detroit, Mich., favoring restoration by the Senate of an appropriation of \$1,400,000 for continuance of operations of the National Resources Planning Board eliminated by the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A resolution of the Fraternal Congress of Maryland and the District of Columbia and also the forty-third annual session of the New York Fraternal Congress, favoring the adoption of an improved and revised calendar dividing the year into 12 months composed of 4 equal quarters to start with the year 1945; to the Committee on Commerce.

A resolution of the one hundred and twenty-sixth convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church, Diocese of Ohio, held in Cleveland, Ohio, requesting that the religious conscience of America be adequately represented on the United States delegation



at the peace conference following the war; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions of Compton Parlor, No. 273, Native Sons of the Golden West, of Compton; Topanga Parlor, No. 269, of Canoga Park, and Los Angeles Parlor, No. 124, of Los Angeles, both of the Native Daughters of the Golden West, all in the State of California, protesting against the formation of a Japanese unit of the United States Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey; to the Committee on Finance.

#### "Senate Joint Resolution 1

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to oppose any legislation transferring to the Federal Government the administration of unemployment compensation

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Board, and other Federal agencies and Federal officials, propose to recommend to the Congress plans that will involve the nationalization of unemployment insurance in the 51 States and jurisdictions of the United States; and

"Whereas transfer of these proper State functions to the Federal Government would eliminate all consideration of local conditions of living and employment; and

"Whereas New Jersey will have collected from employers and workers within its own borders and have available for distribution to jobless workers approximately \$285,000,000 at the close of 1943; and

"Whereas the proposal to federalize unemployment insurance systems of the various States seriously threatens the availability of this fund for use in the State of New Jersey alone, since the unified national system might involve pooling of all State funds; and

"Whereas the New Jersey Legislature by the enactment of chapter 386, pamphlet laws of 1941, directed that the employment service division of the New Jersey Unemployment Compensation Commission, now loaned to the Federal Government for the war emergency, be returned to State service: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey considers that post-war problems may be properly administered only under a State employment security system including both unemployment compensation and employment service and, therefore, respectfully urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to oppose the enactment of any proposal involving the transfer of the administration of unemployment compensation from the States to the Federal Government.

"2. The secretary of state be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Federal Social Security Board.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wyoming; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "Enrolled Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress and the Veterans' Bureau of the United States of America to locate a veterans' hospital at Thermopolis in Hot Springs County, Wyo.

"Whereas one of the inevitable results of the present war will be an increase in the number of members and veterans of the armed services who require hospitalization and medical treatment; and

"Whereas there are located at Thermopolis, in Hot Springs County, Wyo., some of the finest medicinal hot mineral springs in the world, and such city is otherwise ideally suited by reason of climate and other conditions as a location for such a hospital: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, by the House of Representatives of the State of Wyoming (the Senate concurring), That we hereby memorialize the Congress and the Veterans' Bureau of the United States to consider and take appropriate action for the location of a military and veterans' hospital at the city of Thermopolis, Hot Springs County, Wyo.; and be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be sent to the President and Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States, to United States Senators JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY and E. V. RORTON, to Congressman FRANK A. BARRETT, and to the Director of the Veterans' Bureau of the United States."

A concurrent resolution of the general court of the State of New Hampshire; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"Concurrent resolution requesting the Congress of the United States to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army

"Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States a bill to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army; and

"Whereas there is a definite need in this war emergency for the capable handling of drugs, medicines and pharmaceutical supplies which are used in the treatment of diseases of our boys and girls in the armed forces: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the senate and house of representatives in general court convened, That the general court of the State of New Hampshire goes on record as urgently requesting the Congress of the United States to pass legislation without delay to create a pharmacy corps in the United States Army, and be it further resolved that the secretary of state be directed to forward copies of this resolution to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, to the Secretary of War, the Surgeon General of the United States Army and to the Senators and Representatives of this State in Congress."

By Mr. GILLETTE:

A resolution adopted by a meeting held in Carnegie Hall, New York City, favoring the setting up of a systematic and definite relief program for the children of the stricken and hungry countries of Europe; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Resolutions adopted in commemoration of the silver anniversary of the proclamation of independence by the people of Lithuania, held on February 14, 1943, at Webster Hall, New York City, under the auspices of the American Lithuanian Council of Greater New York, reaffirming adherence to, and faith in the enforcement of, the Atlantic Charter and the Declaration of the United Nations; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition, numerously signed, of sundry citizens of Bison, Kans., and vicinity, praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit liquor sales and to suppress vice in the vicinity of military camps and naval establishments; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

A resolution of the House of Delegates of the State of Maryland; to the Committee on Military Affairs:

"House resolution requesting Congress to enact legislation to establish a Pharmacy Corps within the United States Army

"Whereas the experience of every civilized country in the world, as exemplified by the laws on their statute books governing the practice of pharmacy, including those on the statute books of all of the States of our own

country, requires that a pharmacist shall have at least 4 years of professional training in a college of pharmacy to make him a safe person to be entrusted with the responsibility of handling the many dangerous drugs and medicines prescribed by physicians, such as strychnine, morphine, sulfanilamide, bichloride of mercury, serums and vaccines, etc.; and

"Whereas correspondingly competent pharmaceutical service is not afforded the men serving in the Army and is not comparable to that received by our civilian population, such services being performed in the Army in many cases by men with only 90 days of emergency training and in other cases by those who have had no pharmaceutical training whatsoever, thus jeopardizing the health and welfare of our soldiers; and

"Whereas the men in the Army should be afforded pharmaceutical service of at least the same competency and efficiency as that afforded the civilian population; and

"Whereas this can only be accomplished by creating a Pharmacy Corps in the Army, which will have the authority required and the personnel of which will be adequately educated and trained for the purchase, selection, manufacture standardization, storage, and dispensing of medicines and for such other pharmaceutical and administrative duties as their education and training qualifies them to perform: Therefore be it

"Resolved by the House of Delegates of Maryland, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby requested to enact, without delay, legislation to establish a Pharmacy Corps within the United States Army; and be it further

"Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be and he is hereby directed to send a copy of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Secretary of War, to the Surgeon General of the United States, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Member of the United States Congress from the State of Maryland."

By Mr. WHERRY (for himself and Mr. BUTLER):

A resolution of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

"Legislative Resolution 9 opposing war time

"Whereas daylight working hours are a vital factor in the preparation and harvesting of crops, the feeding of farm animals, and the production of farm commodities; and

"Whereas laborers and office workers are, under the new war time, compelled to go to work, and children are compelled to go to school, during the winter months while it is still dark, with a consequent increase in the use of electricity;

"Whereas the new war time, since its establishment, has proved to be wasteful, rather than time saving; therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of Nebraska in fifty-sixth session assembled:

"1. That the Congress of the United States is urged to repeal the act establishing war time, commonly known as daylight-saving time.

"2. That a copy of this resolution, suitably engrossed by the clerk, be sent to each Senator and Representative from Nebraska in the Congress of the United States."

By Mr. THOMAS of Utah:

A joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah; to the Committee on Finance:

#### "House Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial memorializing the President and Congress of the United States to pass at the present session of Congress a social-security law which will allow benefits to every citizen who desires the same, including members of the military forces of our country

"Whereas the present social-security law omits some groups from participating in the benefits of social security; and

"Whereas we feel adequate social-security legislation will solve the social welfare problems which are of most vital concern to our Nation, and will be a foundation for a more secure future of all citizens of our Nation; and

"Whereas some of our citizens in the military personnel of our Nation, due to their former employment, are allowed the advantages of social security and others are not, and each one is working for the same objective and each should have the same opportunity to enjoy the benefits of a secure future; and

"Whereas, in the past groups of people with the same interests have set up, or through legislation have enacted retirement funds, pensions, or security for their future plans, some having been successful and some having failed; and

"Whereas to insure the future of these organizations they should be allowed to come under the National Security Act: Be it

*Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Utah,* That we respectfully urge the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, a Social Security Act which will retain the Federal-State relationship now provided for in the Social Security Act, but which will include every citizen who wishes to participate, including the military forces of our country; be it further

*Resolved,* That a certified copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to the Secretary of State, and to each Senator and Representative of the United States Congress from this State; be it further

*Resolved,* That provision be made for farmer, business, and professional men and other self-employed persons to buy into the social-security program on terms comparable to those now in effect for employed people."

(The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a memorial identical with the foregoing, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.)

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 643. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to pay the costs of transportation of certain civilian employees, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 71).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 555. A bill for the relief of Almos W. Glasgow; with an amendment (Rept. No. 72);

H. R. 1639. A bill for the relief of Frank and Paulina Rublein and Mrs. Ethel Bowers; without amendment (Rept. No. 74); and

H. R. 1786. A bill for the relief of Fairbanks, Morse & Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 75).

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

S. 675. A bill to amend the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, so as to extend the benefits of the Employees' Compensation Act to conscientious objectors; without amendment (Rept. No. 73).

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

S. 360. A bill to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service; with an amendment (Rept. No. 76).

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unani-

LXXXIX—87

mous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. McCARRAN:

S. 789. A bill to provide for the mailing of annual notices to owners of tax exempt properties in the District of Columbia;

S. 790. A bill to prohibit the issuance of alcoholic beverage licenses in certain localities in the District of Columbia, to prohibit advertising the price of such beverages, and for other purposes; and

S. 791. A bill to effectuate the intent of the Congress as expressed in section 1, paragraph (k) of Public Law 846, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved December 24, 1942, by adding to the list of institutions named in said paragraph the name of the American Tree Association, an institution similar to the institutions so named; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. VANDENBERG:

S. 792. A bill to increase the amount of Federal aid to State or Territorial homes for the support of disabled soldiers and sailors of the United States; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 793. A bill to establish a reserve of Government-owned agricultural commodities; and

S. 794. A bill to provide for a new base period, and for considering increases in the cost of farm labor, in determining parity prices for certain agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 795. A bill relating to certain restrictions applicable to agricultural commodities; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. CONNALLY:

S. 796. A bill relating to the use and operation by the United States of certain plants in the interests of the national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bill 797, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER also introduced Senate bill 798, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

(Mr. LANGER also (for himself and Mr. GURNEY) introduced Senate bill 799, which was referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 800. A bill to authorize certain officers of the Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard to act as notaries public during the existence of war or a national emergency and 6 months thereafter; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. BROOKS:

S. 801. A bill for the relief of Clara A. Andresen; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. BYRD introduced Senate bill 802, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. BARBOUR:

S. 803. A bill for the relief of Marie A. Atanasio; and

S. 804. A bill for the relief of Ralph B. Coleman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 805. A bill for the relief of William D. Warren; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 806. A bill for the relief of the estate of E. H. Zimmerman; and

S. 807. A bill for the relief of Mary Frances Hutson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. J. Res. 39. Joint resolution to extend certain provisions of law relating to overtime compensation to employees in the Library of Congress; to the Committee on Civil Service.

#### INCREASE OF SOLDIERS' BASE PAY

Mr. LANGER. I introduce a bill to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to increase the monthly base pay of enlisted men.

In this connection I wish to say that several months ago, when the matter was before the Senate, I made a motion to raise the base pay to \$100, and the bill I am now introducing proposes to carry out that suggestion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 797) to amend section 9 of the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, so as to increase the monthly base pay of enlisted men, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

#### FORECLOSURE OF MORTGAGES BY H. O. L. C.

Mr. LANGER. I introduce a bill relating to foreclosure of mortgages held by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

In this connection I wish to say that hundreds of folks are losing their homes in the Northwest, among them many university professors, because the cost of living has gone up without a corresponding increase in salaries, with the result that they cannot meet payments to the Home Owners' Loan Corporation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 798) relating to foreclosure of mortgages held by the Home Owners' Loan Corporation was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

#### LANDS IN TRUST FOR INDIAN USE

Mr. LANGER. On behalf of the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. GURNEY] and myself, I introduce a bill to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for the Indian use, and for other purposes. It relates to South Dakota and North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 799) to declare that the United States holds certain lands in trust for Indian use, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1975) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, to provide supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### CONFIRMATION BY SENATE OF CERTAIN GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES

Mr. HATCH submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 575) to provide that officers in the executive branch of the Government who receive compensation at a rate in excess of \$4,500 a year shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, in the manner provided by the Constitution, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary and ordered to be printed.



# VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION EDUCATION, AND SO FORTH, OF DISABLED MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND THOSE IN WAR INDUSTRIES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. TAFT submitted three amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 180) to provide vocational rehabilitation education, training, and other services to persons disabled while members of the armed forces, or disabled in war industries or otherwise and to render such persons fit for service in war industries, agriculture, or other useful civilian industry, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

## SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON HOUSING

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. ELLENDER], I submit a resolution with regard to an investigation of the housing situation.

Some days ago I submitted a similar resolution providing for such an investigation by a subcommittee of the Committee on Education and Labor. Because of the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency also has had to deal with F. H. A. and the housing under its charge, it has seemed desirable to have this special committee, made up of three members of the Committee on Education and Labor and three members of the Committee on Banking and Currency. That is the only change in the resolution which I heretofore submitted.

The resolution (S. Res. 112) was read and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, as follows:

Whereas the United States Government is now the owner of numerous projects to provide residence quarters for war workers and lower-income groups which were constructed by the United States Housing Authority, the Federal Works Administrator, the War Department, the Navy Department, the Farm Security Administration, the Defense Homes Corporation, and other agencies; and

Whereas the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal home-loan banks, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Loan Administrator, the Federal Works Administrator, and other agencies have financed or assisted the financing of various other housing activities; and

Whereas on February 24, 1942, the President of the United States, acting under the authority vested in him by title I of the First War Powers Act, 1941, provided for the consolidation of functions of Federal agencies relating to housing in a National Housing Agency, and said National Housing Agency has continued to exercise the functions consolidated in it; and

Whereas the effect of said Executive order expires with the expiration of the First War Powers Act, 1941, and great confusion will result from the expiration of said Executive order if permanent legislative provision is not made to deal with the subject of housing; and

Whereas numerous projects have been constructed under emergency legislation to provide housing for war workers, the disposition of which housing after the war has been left for future legislative determination; and

Whereas the figures now obtainable appear to show that there is now a serious shortage of housing, and the construction of housing in the period which follows the war should be an effective means of preventing industrial

depression; and there is need for a constructive and over-all plan for the provision of such housing through private and public agencies; and for the permanent coordination of all Government activities related to such housing: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby established a special committee to be known as the Special Committee on Housing, to be composed of three members of the Committee on Education and Labor to be appointed by the chairman of such committee, and three members of the Committee on Banking and Currency to be appointed by the chairman of such committee, which special committee is hereby authorized—

(1) To study the work of all branches of the National Housing Agency, including the Federal Housing Administration, the Federal Home Loan Bank Administration, the Home Owners' Loan Corporation, the Federal Savings and Loan Insurance Corporation, the Federal Public Housing Authority, the Defense Homes Corporation, the Alley Dwelling Authority of the District of Columbia, and all other Federal agencies exercising functions in connection with housing activities, and prepare a report showing the work of such agencies and the present status of all projects undertaken, financed, or managed by them;

(2) To recommend a plan for the disposition of emergency housing at the termination of the war emergency;

(3) To prepare a comprehensive plan for the construction of housing after the war, including that to be provided or financed by private capital or private agencies, and that to be provided or financed by Government funds or Government agencies, and all other housing, with special reference to the possibility of encouraging home ownership and of eliminating slums and other deteriorated areas, and with special reference to the extent of the necessity of the Federal Government's subsidizing housing for lower income groups.

For the purpose of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Seventy-eighth Congress, to employ such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures as it deems advisable. The cost of stenographic services to report such hearings shall not be in excess of 25 cents per hundred words. The expenses of the committee, which shall not exceed \$25,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. VAN NUYS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be authorized to make reports on pending nominations, bills, and resolutions during any adjournment or recess of the Senate following today's session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## AUTHORIZATION FOR THE COMMITTEE ON NAVAL AFFAIRS TO FILE REPORTS

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Naval Affairs be permitted to file reports during the interim between now and Thursday in the event the Senate shall adjourn or recess from today to Thursday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

## THE NAVY COLLEGE TRAINING PROGRAM

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, there has been much comment in the press and elsewhere concerning the operation of the naval college training program.

The Navy Department has completed its regulations with respect to this program, and will shortly have ready for distribution in pamphlet form the details of this plan, which includes information as to the purpose of the program, the selection of colleges under the program, arrangements made by the Navy Department with colleges, together with the details which will be of special interest to the Members of Congress, namely, the qualifications and procurement of students who may be enrolled in the program.

In view of the fact that Members of the Congress will have requests from their constituents as to the qualifications and procedure for students to enroll in this program, I ask unanimous consent that the plan as prepared by the Navy Department be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the plan was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

## PLAN FOR OPERATION OF THE NAVY COLLEGE TRAINING PROGRAM V-12

### I. PURPOSE OF PROGRAM

A new Navy college-training program to be known as V-12 will eventually supersede the present V-1 and V-7 programs. Its purpose is to produce naval officers chosen from young high-school seniors, high-school graduates, and college students who appear to have the potentialities for ultimate selection as officers after carefully prescribed college training. The plan contemplates that this college training will be carried on while the men are on active duty, in uniform, receiving pay and under general military discipline.

### II. SELECTION OF COLLEGES

The selection of the educational institutions which will participate in this program will be made by a joint committee consisting of representatives of the armed forces and the War Manpower Commission. In the event of failure on the part of the members of the committee to agree, the final decision will be made by the Chairman of the War Manpower Commission. All correspondence on this subject will be answered only by this committee and should be addressed to the Joint Committee for the Selection of Non-Federal Educational Institutions, room 3732, Navy Department, Arlington Annex, Washington, D. C.

### III. PROCUREMENT OF STUDENTS ENROLLED IN PROGRAM

#### 1. Qualifications

##### A. Civilians

(1) For admission to the screening test described in paragraph 3 (b) on page 3, the following will be considered for the test to be given April 1943:

(a) High-school and preparatory-school graduates who will have attained their 17th and not their 20th birthdays by July 1, 1943, regardless of whether they are presently attending college.

(b) High-school and preparatory-school seniors who will be graduated by July 1, 1943, provided they will have attained their 17th and not their 20th birthdays by that date.

(c) Students who do not hold certificates of graduation from a secondary school but who are continuing their education in an accredited college or university.

(2) For admission to the screening test to be given late in 1943, all applicants for V-12, except those who were in college in the spring of 1943 and those to graduate from high school or prep school midyear winter 1943-44, must produce certificates of graduation from high or prep school.

(3) To be considered, each applicant shall:

(a) Be a male citizen of the United States.

(b) Be morally and physically qualified for this program, including a minimum visual acuity of 18/20.

(c) Be unmarried, and agree to remain unmarried until commissioned, unless sooner released by the Navy Department.

(d) Evidence potential officer qualifications, including appearance and scholarship records.

Candidates who cannot meet the above requirements are advised not to apply.

#### B. Enlisted men in Regular Navy or Naval Reserve

(1) In order to be considered, each applicant shall:

(a) Be on active duty.

(b) Be a male citizen of the United States.

(c) Be morally and physically qualified for this program, including a minimum visual acuity of 18/20.

(d) Have a minimum education of graduation from high school with a creditable scholarship rating and a maximum education of not more than 3 years of college (men having more than 2 years of college are eligible for the Reserve midshipmen program). The candidate's signed statement in this regard may be accepted.

(e) Be between his 17th and 23d birthday on the day application is submitted.

(f) Be unmarried, and agree to remain unmarried until commissioned, unless sooner released by the Navy Department.

(g) Be recommended by their commanding officers (the commanding officers through whom individual requests for this training are submitted should bear in mind that their recommendations will be the most important single factor in the selection of such men and should assure themselves that candidates whom they recommend are within the prescribed age limit, have the educational requirements and are physically qualified). The commanding officer's responsibility is clear to nominate only desirable applicants for this training which leads to commissioned officer status in the United States Naval Reserve.

(h) Must have passed the general classification test with a mark of 85 (if the individual meets all other requirements and has not taken a classification test, or the mark is not available, paragraph (g) shall be stressed).

(i) Each applicant must sign a statement that he is willing to accept reduction in rating to apprentice seamen (the rating held by other students).

#### 2. Preference for colleges, courses of study, and branch of service

a. Successful candidates will be permitted to indicate their preferences as to colleges on the Navy list to which they wish to be assigned, and those preferences will be respected insofar as possible, within geographical limits and student availability within the area. No guarantees, however, can be made that a student's request for a given institution will be granted.

b. Students will be permitted to express preliminary choice of the branch of service, i. e., Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard, at the time of assignment to the V-12 program, but this choice will not be binding. Final assignment will be based upon demonstrated ability and counseling during the

first two semesters and the needs of the service.

c. Students will be permitted to express preliminary choice of the course of study; i. e., medicine, engineering, etc. Assignment and continuance in these courses will be based upon available quotas and demonstrated competence in the particular fields of subject matter required.

#### 3. Procedures for civilian selection

a. A quota for the year 1943 of high-school seniors who will be graduated by July 1, 1943, high-school graduates, and college students not in an armed force program will be assigned to each State. One-half of this quota will be placed on active duty about July 1, 1943, and one-half about November 1, 1943.

b. A screening test will be administered at local or nearby schools or colleges for all volunteers. The screening test will be given on the same day throughout the country, and all candidates within the continental limits of the United States must take this test on the same day in order to qualify. This test will be given at a date to be announced, approximately April 2, 1943. A similar test will be given late in 1943 for the then eligible students who, after fully qualifying and being accepted, will be placed on active duty about March 1, 1944.

c. Preliminary application forms for the V-12 program will be distributed through local high schools and colleges. Each applicant must submit this form, properly filled out and certified by a high-school principal or college administrator before admission to the screening test. The certifying authority is directed to eliminate, by refusal to certify, applications of candidates who obviously fall below the physical standards or who show evidence of inadequate educational preparation.

d. Tests will be scored by various regional offices which administer the screening tests indicated in paragraph (b) above. These offices will be designated by the Training Division, Bureau of Naval Personnel.

e. During a given period of a month or six weeks, successful applicants will be requested to report at their own expense to the nearest Office of Naval Officer Procurement.

f. In the few States wherein there is no Office of Naval Officer Procurement, a temporary branch office will be set up for this purpose.

g. On reporting to the Office of Naval Officer Procurement, the candidate will be interviewed to determine potential officerlike qualities, and given a physical examination.

h. Selection will be made by a committee from candidates who are qualified up to this point. The decision of these committees will be final in choosing the proper number of candidates to fill the quota.

i. The selection committee will be composed as follows:

(1) An educator who will be selected on the basis of his competence in appraising qualifications of prospective college students.

(2) A representative civilian who will be selected from a panel nominated by the present civilian committees, which are now set up near practically every Office of Naval Officer Procurement.

(3) A naval officer who should be a senior officer of the Office of Naval Officer Procurement.

There shall be at least one such committee in each State, and in States wherein there is more than one Office of Naval Officer Procurement, there shall be at least one such committee for each office. The civilians on these committees may be on a contract basis in order that the Navy shall have some directive power over their time.

j. Accepted candidates under 18 years of age shall be enlisted in class V-12, United States Naval Reserve by the Office of Naval Officer

Procurement and placed on inactive duty until they are ordered to college. Candidates over 18 years of age shall be inducted under selective-service procedures and then enlisted into the Naval Reserve, class V-12, by the Office of Naval Officer Procurement and placed on inactive duty or furlough without pay until ordered to college. Students will enter colleges in three groups in July, November of 1943 and March 1944.

k. Service and health records on each accepted candidate shall be retained in the Office of Naval Officer Procurement until transferred with the candidate when ordered to active duty. Enlistment, or proper portions of induction papers will be forwarded to the Bureau of Naval Personnel for retention in the Procurement Division.

#### 4. Procedures for selection of enlisted reserves and probationary commissioned students

##### A. V-5 Students

The naval aviation cadet selection boards shall continue to obtain through induction (or enlistment) V-5 candidates up to the total yearly quota. These candidates will be obtained by present methods of selection. From this quota the number authorized to enter the college program will be sent to the Office of Naval Officer Procurement for approval by the selection committees stationed there during the selection period. The papers of those selected will be transferred to the Office of Naval Officer Procurement concerned, and the candidate transferred to class V-12, United States Naval Reserve, in the rating of apprentice seaman, and assigned to colleges at the same time as other V-12 students.

##### B. V-1 Students

Enrollment of college students in the V-1 program will not be accepted after March 15, 1943, and enrollment may be terminated earlier if quotas are filled. Those students enrolled in this program who are in or have completed the final term of their sophomore year in March 1943, will be given qualifying examinations about April 1, 1943. Other V-1 students will continue their college training until the last half of their sophomore year, at which time they will be given the qualifying examination. The Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel will be responsible for the construction, administration, and scoring of these tests. Based on reports of these tests furnished by the Training Division, the Procurement Division will assign men to further college training as desired. Those candidates who fail the test will be ordered to general enlisted service on active duty in the Navy. Those who are accepted will be placed on active duty as apprentice seamen, or class V-5, with pay, subsistence, and uniforms, and on July 1, 1943, will be assigned to colleges designated by the Bureau of Naval Personnel, to spend full time in completing their college training. For schedule on continuance of education for V-1 students, see subparagraph d below.

##### C. V-7 Students Now Enrolled

The present V-7 students who have more than one term to complete for a degree will be placed on active duty and ordered to the various colleges on the same date as the V-12 students. Those V-7 students who have one term or less to complete for a degree may remain on inactive duty in the college which they have been attending. Those V-7 students who have one term or less to complete for a degree and who desire to be placed on active duty, will be placed on active duty but not necessarily in the college which they have been attending.

##### D. Schedule for V-1 and V-7 Students

(1) V-1 and V-7 students will continue their education on the following schedule:

(a) Students who are selected to complete college training for the purpose of qualifying them for appointment in professional classes



of the Naval Reserve will be permitted to complete additional equivalent semesters, so that upon graduation they will have completed a total number of semesters as follows:

	Total semesters
Chaplains.....	12
Medical and dental.....	12
Engineer specialists.....	8

(b) Students who are selected for training to qualify them for engineers for general duty, deck, supply, or Marine Corps general duty will be permitted to complete additional equivalent semesters as follows:

Those who had on July 1 completed 7 semesters will receive 1 additional semester.

Those who had on July 1 completed 6 semesters will receive 1 additional semester.

Those who had on July 1 completed 5 semesters will receive 2 additional semesters.

Those who had on July 1 completed 4 semesters will receive 2 additional semesters.

Those who had on July 1 completed 3 semesters will receive 3 additional semesters.

Those who had on July 1 completed 2 semesters will receive 3 additional semesters.

Those who had on July 1 completed 1 semester will receive 4 additional semesters.

(2) Engineer reservists following the specialist program, regardless of the number of equivalent semesters completed on July 1, 1943, will be allowed to continue their college training at institutions designated by the Navy until they have completed a total of eight equivalent semesters since matriculation.

(3) Course requirements in the V-1 and V-7 programs were stated in the Navy announcement of March 1, 1942, in general terms only. It is impossible, therefore, for the Bureau of Naval Personnel to specify the completion programs in detail. The Bureau will, however, require that V-1 and V-7 reservists complete the following minimum programs for the several classifications by the end of their college training:

*Minimum requirements to be completed in college*

[V-1, accredited college program; V-7, college juniors and seniors]

Type of service	Candidates for eventual commission in classification	Subject	Required minimum length of course <sup>1</sup>
a. Deck (general service) and aviation.	D-V (S).....	English.....	1 year.
	D-V (G).....	Mathematics.....	1 year, including completion of trigonometry.
	C-V (S) and A-V (N), SC-V (G) except engineering drawing not required.	Physics.....	1 year, including laboratory.
		Engineering drawing.....	1/2 year.
b. Engineering (general service).	E-V (G).....	Navigation.....	Desirable.
		English.....	1 year.
		Mathematics.....	Through trigonometry.
		Physics.....	1 year.
c. Engineering specialists (mechanical engineering).	E-V (S), O-V (S), and A-V (S), CC-V (S).	Chemistry.....	Do.
		Engineering drawing.....	Do.
		Elementary heat-power engineering.....	Desirable.
		Navigation.....	Do.
		English.....	1 year.
		Mathematics.....	Through integral calculus.
		Physics.....	1 year, including laboratory.
		Chemistry.....	Do.
		Analytic mechanics and strength of materials.....	1 year.
		Hydraulics.....	1/2 year.
		Kinematics and machine design.....	1 year.
		Thermodynamics.....	1/2 year.
d. Engineering specialists (electrical engineering power).	E-V (S), O-V (S).	Heat-power engineering (steam).....	1/2 year, including laboratory.
		Internal combustion.....	Do.
		Electrical engineering <sup>1</sup> .....	1 year.
		English.....	1 year.
		Mathematics.....	Through integral calculus.
		Physics.....	1 year, including laboratory.
		Analytic mechanics and strength of materials.....	1 year.
		Heat power.....	1/2 year.
		Direct and alternating currents.....	1 year.
		Electrical machinery, D. C. and A. C.....	Do.
		English.....	Do.
		Mathematics.....	Through linear differential equations.
e. Engineering specialists (electrical engineering, communications, and ultrahigh frequency).	E-V (S), O-V (S), A-V (S).	Physics.....	1 year, including laboratory.
		Direct and alternating currents.....	1 year.
		Electronics and high-frequency circuits.....	Do.
		English.....	Do.
		Mathematics.....	Through integral calculus.
		Physics.....	One year including laboratory.
		Analytic mechanics and strength of materials.....	1 year.
		Structures.....	Do.
		Hydraulics.....	1/2 year.
		Surveying.....	1 year.
		Heat-power.....	1/2 year.
		Electrical engineering.....	Do.
f. Engineering specialists (Civil Engineering Corps).	CEC-V (S).....	Highways.....	Do.
		Sanitary engineering.....	Do.
		English.....	Do.
		Chemistry, including inorganic, qualitative, and organic.....	1 year.
		Physics.....	2 years.
		Biology (1/2 year to be zoology).....	1 year, including laboratory.
		French or German.....	Do.
			2 years (school) or college.
g. Medical and Dental Corps.	MC-V (S) and DC-V (S).	English.....	1 year.
		Chemistry, including inorganic, qualitative, and organic.....	2 years.
		Physics.....	1 year, including laboratory.
		Biology (1/2 year to be zoology).....	Do.

**E. Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps Students**

(1) All members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps who are enlisted in class V-1 will be ordered to active duty about July 1, 1943, concurrently with those students who are enlisted in the V-12 program. Although on active duty, they will continue their Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps training as at present until they have completed their advanced course. While on active duty, they will receive the pay and allowances of an apprentice seaman.

(2) Members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps who are not enlisted in class V-1 may make application for appointment as reserve midshipmen prior to April 1, 1943. If accepted, they will be ordered to inactive duty and will continue their Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps training at their own expense until about July 1, or when the V-12 program becomes effective.

(3) All members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps graduating before July 1, 1943, will be commissioned as ensigns in the United States Naval Reserve. Those who sever their connection with their college before July 1, 1943, will be discharged from the Naval Reserve, or at their own request, be ordered to active duty in an enlisted status. Those who maintain their connection, in good standing, but do not graduate before July 1, 1943, will be transferred to class V-12 as apprentice seamen, and will be ordered to active duty as outlined in subparagraph (1) above.

(4) The V-12 program is expected to be placed in effect approximately July 1, 1943. As presently planned, this program contemplates the continued existence of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps in substantially the same manner as at present. It is believed that present staffs and facilities are adequate to administer and handle any changes which may be brought about through the operation of the V-12 program.

(5) Commencing on approximately March 1, 1944, candidates for the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps will be obtained from apprentice seamen, class V-12, who have previously completed the first 2 4-month semesters of instruction in the V-12 program. Those candidates who are enrolled in the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps are then expected to continue their training as members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps for 4 additional 4-month semesters. This training will require a total of 2 calendar years.

(6) Although those members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps will be on active duty as apprentice seamen, class V-12, they will continue to be uniformed as hitherto.

(7) At present the curriculum is divided into a basic and an advanced course. Commencing as above, inasmuch as all enrollees will have previously received two basic semesters of general instruction under the V-12 program, they will immediately enter into their Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps training. Beginning as above, the instruction will no longer be referred to as "basic course" and "advanced course," but will be combined and designated as Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps course. The curriculum for this course will be revised to include the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps instruction not previously covered during the first 2 semesters of the V-12 program. Additional subject matter will be included if considered necessary by this bureau. A copy of the finished curriculum for the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps course will be forwarded to the Professor of Naval Science and Tactics prior to November 1, 1943.

<sup>1</sup> A minimum year course is considered to be the equivalent of a course meeting 3 class-hours per week for at least 30 weeks.

(8) For purposes of administration, the members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps who have been secured through the V-12 program will be divided into two classes:

(a) Those who are receiving instruction for the first two semesters will be designated second classmen, and

(b) Those receiving instruction for the last two semesters will be designated first classmen.

(9) Members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps will receive the same pay and allowances, medical services, etc., as all other apprentice seamen, class V-12, on active duty.

(10) Present members of the Naval Reserve Officers' Training Corps will receive the same instruction as originally planned on the accelerated schedule.

**F. Enlisted Reserve Corps Students (Students Who Were Enrolled in the Basic Course, Army Reserve Officers' Training Corps, Because of Required Military Training at Institution)**

When other members of the Enlisted Reserve Corps are called to active service, those in the above category who have requested assignment to the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard will, if qualified and accepted by the Navy, be enlisted in the V-1 program and handled in accordance with paragraph b above.

#### G. Present Probationary Commissioned Students

When the V-12 program goes into effect, students now holding probationary commissions in the United States Naval Reserve, on inactive duty in a deferred status, will be permitted to resign and accept assignment to the V-12 program as apprentice seamen on active duty without meeting the age requirements specified for civilians entering this program. At the satisfactory completion of their prescribed professional education, they will be again commissioned in the United States Naval Reserve, if physically qualified.

#### 5. Procedures for Selection of Enlisted Men Now on Duty

##### A. General Considerations

(1) A quota (total 10,000) will be assigned to the enlisted personnel of the Navy. Increments of this quota will be assigned to the main distribution commands listed below.

(2) The assignment of these quotas will be on a percentage basis of the total 10,000 based on the number of personnel shown to be on hand by the latest composite reports of the large distribution commands. The quotas assigned to shore activities will be reduced by 20 percent to equalize the effect of personnel on shore who are not physically qualified for sea duty, and to favor men serving at sea.

(3) Enlisted men will be ordered to report in three groups so as to permit an even flow into the schools which will be beginning semesters in July, November of 1943, and March of 1944.

(4) Individual enlisted men meeting the qualifications listed below may apply for this college program on an application blank which shall be comparable to the one used by enlisted men in applying for a commissioned rank. Approved applications will be forwarded by the commanding officer directly to the large distribution commands. Commanding officers will indicate the priority in which men under their command are recommended. These commands will select the proper number of men to fill the increment of the quota assigned to them by the Bureau. The applications of these successful candidates will be forwarded to the Bureau of Naval Personnel (Procurement Division).

(5) At the proper time the men will be ordered to report to the various colleges as directed by the Bureau of Naval Personnel. Those men who have not taken the general classification test will be ordered via the

nearest district command where they will be given the general classification test or a comparable screening test designated by the Bureau of Naval Personnel. Those passing this test will be ordered to the several colleges. Those not passing the test will be returned to general detail.

(6) Enlisted personnel selected for this training will be retained in their existing branch of service whether United States Navy or United States Naval Reserve, and those who fail to successfully complete the program and receive commissions in the Naval Reserve will be restored to general service in their former ratings.

#### B. Assignment of Quotas

Quotas will be assigned to the following commands who will choose the proper number of personnel from the applications forwarded directly to them by the commanding officers to fill the necessary increment of the total quotas.

(1) Commander Service Force, Pacific Fleet, Subordinate Command.

(a) For all activities for whom he distributes personnel in accordance with reference (a), Bu. Pers. Cir. Ltr. No. 154-42.

(2) Commander Service Force, Atlantic Fleet, Subordinate Command.

(a) For all activities for whom he distributes personnel in accordance with reference (a), Bu. Pers. Cir. Ltr. No. 154-42.

(3) Commander Southeast Pacific Force.

(a) For all ships and outlying stations under his command.

(4) Commandant, Fifteenth Naval District.

(a) For all Districts and Panama Sea Frontier Force activities.

(5) Commandants of all Naval Districts in the continental limits of the United States, and the Commandant of the Potomac and Severn River Naval Commands.

(a) For all activities within the boundaries of their respective commands not included in (1) and (2) above, whether or not they distribute personnel to them in accordance with Bu. Pers. Cir. Ltr. No. 154-42.

**NOTE.**—Special instructions will be issued to the Commandants concerning prorating quotas to recruits at naval training stations, men on general detail, armed guard personnel under instruction in service schools, United States Navy construction training centers, etc., to afford availability of this plan to the maximum number of personnel in a transitory status.

(b) Assignment of quotas will be on a percentage basis, 10,000 total, based on the number of personnel shown by latest composite reports of activities listed above, except that numbers reported in shore activities will be reduced by 20 percent to equalize the effects of personnel on shore who are not physically qualified for sea duty. Men selected will be sent to school in 3 increments of one-third of the total quota, each 4 months. The first increment will be supplied by July 1, 1943, and each additional increment 4 months thereafter.

#### C. Coast Guard and Marine Corps

(1) The quota for the Coast Guard will be filled by taking 450 enlisted men to be selected by them and the remaining 270 to be taken from civilian sources.

(2) The quota for the Marine Corps will be 1,000 from enlisted sources and 2,500 from civilian sources.

(3) These quotas will be included in the total Navy quotas.

#### IV. ARRANGEMENTS WITH COLLEGES

Contracts with the institutions will provide for training, housing, feeding, and medical service.

The contract with the institution will insure a definite minimum number of men. Students may or may not be housed in

groups, depending upon local conditions. It is the responsibility of the institution to see that satisfactory feeding and housing is maintained. Contracts with the institutions will cover the cost of same.

A cooperating institution will be required to accept men ordered to it for training. At the same time, each institution will be expected to maintain high standards of selectivity in examinations, instructions, etc., and to recommend transfer to other duty of students who fail to meet those standards.

#### V. ADMINISTRATION AND PROGRAM AT THE COLLEGES

All administration of the program at the colleges will be under the cognizance of the Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

##### 1. Administration

All units of the program will be under the command of commanding officers. Such commanding officers will be under the jurisdiction of the district commandants with respect to purely military matters only. They will report to the Chief of Naval Personnel. The size of the administrative staffs assigned to the colleges will depend upon the number of enlisted men attached. Where the number so warrants, this staff will include a commanding officer and the necessary executive staff plus a disbursing officer and medical officer (or pharmacist mate). The latter two will be necessary in order to provide for issue of uniforms, monthly pay, allotments, insurance, etc., and vaccinations, inoculations, hospitalization, with suitable entries on health records. Chief specialists will be provided for physical training and indoctrination.

##### 2. Curricula

The Training Division will prescribe the curricula which are necessary to insure production of officer material for the various branches of naval service, including aviation cadets, engineer and deck officers, engineer specialists, medical and dental officers, Supply Corps officers, and chaplains. Curricula will vary in length, depending on training requirements. The length of course for chaplains, medical and dental officers will be twelve 16-week terms, engineering specialists eight 16-week terms, engineering for general duty six 16-week terms, deck and marine line officers four 16-week terms, and aviators two 16-week terms.

There will be three 16-week terms in each calendar year. Courses for the first two 16-week terms, or the equivalent, will be similar for all students except premedical and pre-dental (for these students, chemistry and foreign languages are substituted for English and history) and will emphasize fundamental college work in mathematics, science, English, history, engineering drawing, and physical training. All students inducted in the V-12 program will receive instruction in naval organization and general naval orientation. The amount of time devoted to this work will not exceed three classes per week during the first two semesters.

Outlines of all curricula will be prepared by the Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel, with such assistance as may be required from representative educators or educational societies.

If the college is satisfied that the student has adequately covered any of the subjects included in the curricula, proper substitutes will be permitted.

##### 3. Discipline

Discipline and separation from the training program will be handled as follows:

(1) Minor matters of internal discipline (such as demerits, etc.) will be administered locally by the commanding officer of the school.

(2) Separation from the program (not from the service) for disciplinary reasons



will be accomplished only by the Bureau of Naval Personnel (Officer Discipline Section) and all such cases will be referred to the Bureau by the commanding officer of the school. They will then be referred to the Officer Discipline Section via the Training Division.

(3) The extent of the disciplinary action in subparagraph (2) above is to drop a man from the officer candidate program. When this is done, the man automatically reverts to ordinary enlisted status, and is available for assignment to general service or further disciplinary action. Such further disciplinary action, such as mast punishments, courts martial, or separation from the service, is solely the responsibility of the established Enlisted Discipline Section of the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

(4) Cases warranting separation from the officer candidate program for scholastic reasons, as reported by the faculty of the college or as reported by naval personnel as the result of screening tests, will be referred to the Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel by the commanding officer of the school for action, and that division will decide the disposition of the cases.

#### 4. Physical training

##### A. Compulsory

Will be given to all enlisted students in the form of physical drills, swimming, and setting-up exercises to be limited to several hours per week.

##### B. Voluntary

Enlisted students under the V-12 Program will be permitted to take part in all college athletics and other activities of the campus on the same basis as civilian students insofar as it does not interfere with their prescribed hours or courses of study.

#### 5. Extracurricular activities (other than physical, covered above)

Students will be permitted to participate in college extracurricular activities the same as civilian students insofar as it does not interfere with their prescribed hours or courses of study.

#### 6. Liberty

Insofar as possible, enlisted students will be required to maintain the Navy's standard of discipline. Military activities will be kept to a minimum and will be subordinated, consistent with necessary military supervision, to academic training.

#### 7. Pay and allowances

As mentioned under Administration above, a disbursing officer will be provided to one or a group of colleges, depending on the number of enlisted students and location. All students will be encouraged to make substantial allotments for insurance and Government bonds as it is considered desirable for them to inaugurate systematic financial habits at an early phase in their naval career, and will further limit their spending money to an amount not detrimental to their training.

#### 8. Fraternities

Enlisted students will be allowed to join all previously established organizations or fraternities on the campus already in existence and available to all students on the same terms. They will not be permitted to establish or join any activity or organization not available to membership to all students either civilian or enlisted on the campus or which might be inimical to naval interests.

#### VI. ASSIGNMENT AT COMPLETION OF TRAINING

1. Upon satisfactory completion of college training, all students may be assigned to appropriate specialized training in the Navy, Marine Corps, or Coast Guard.

2. If found qualified upon completion of this specialized training, students will be commissioned in the appropriate Reserve.

#### VII. DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITIES FOR PROGRAM

1. The Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel will have cognizance of:

- Provision of schools and facilities.
- Selection of teaching staffs.
- Curricula and methods of instruction.
- Examination of achievement.

The Training Division will give achievement examinations at the end of the first two terms. The result of these examinations will be used in determining further assignments.

e. Reporting to Procurement Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel all necessary information concerning the progress and status of individuals, and recommending to the procurement division action such as advancement, appointment, etc.

2. The Procurement Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel is responsible for decisions as to:

- Enrollment.
- Call to active duty and subsequent orders.
- Appointment and commissioning as recommended by the Training Division of the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

#### SUFFRAGE FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ADDRESS BY JAMES R. KIRKLAND

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point an address delivered by James R. Kirkland, a prominent attorney of the District of Columbia, and chairman of the District of Columbia Bar Association, before the Central Business Association on February 11. In his remarks Mr. Kirkland discusses intelligently and concisely some of the problems of District residents—I should like to say "District citizens," but that is almost satirical, considering the treatment accorded the good Americans who make their homes in the National Capital.

I endorse fully Mr. Kirkland's statement that—

In this day when America is bringing liberty to all the people of the world, it is shameful that she neglects the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Without in any way seeming critical of the efforts of many Americans who are insisting that Britain give the people of India the right to run their own government, I am suggesting that before we take on the Indian problem of the British Empire, these good people should first free the people who reside in the District of Columbia.

These Americans are taxed without representation. They are drafted into the armed services without representation. Thousands of Washingtonians are fighting today on scattered fronts all over the globe, to carry the four freedoms to the people of all the world—except to their own relatives and themselves in the District of Columbia.

I believe thoroughly in our representative form of government. I also believe it should be representative for all American citizens in the United States. I hold that the resident citizens of the District of Columbia should be represented in Congress, should have the right to choose their representatives in Congress, and should also be allowed to participate in the election of President and Vice President.

I again direct the attention of the Senate to Senate Joint Resolution 33, introduced by me, which proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia. It is a companion resolution to that introduced in the House of Representatives by the Honorable HATTON W. SUMNERS of Texas, chairman of the House Judiciary Committee.

I ask that a copy of Senate Joint Resolution 33 be printed at this point as a part of my remarks, to be followed by a copy of the remarks delivered by Mr. Kirkland.

There being no objection, the joint resolution and address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### Senate Joint Resolution 33

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States empowering Congress to grant representation in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President to the people of the District of Columbia

*Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following amendment to the Constitution of the United States be proposed for ratification by the legislatures of the several States which, when ratified by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within seven years of the date of its passage, shall be valid as a part of said Constitution, namely:*

"The Congress shall have power to provide that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the government of the United States, in such numbers and with such powers as the Congress shall determine. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

#### SPEECH BY JAMES R. KIRKLAND BEFORE CENTRAL BUSINESS ASSOCIATION FEBRUARY 11, 1943

I come to you today as the chairman of the District of Columbia Bar Association Committee on Americanization. I also come to you as a citizen and a property holder in the District of Columbia. In this day when America is bringing liberty to all the peoples of the world, it is shameful that she neglects the citizens of the District of Columbia. The four freedoms have transcended the seven seas, but the Atlantic Charter has not yet come to the shores of the Potomac.

It is high time that we Washingtonians should do something about this condition. No greater affront has ever been offered us than the refusal of new Congressmen to serve on the congressional Committee on the District of Columbia. I say that that was an affront. I say also that we have been harping on this matter of suffrage for such a long time that perhaps like Tara's harp it will finally resound through the monumental marble halls of the Federal Government. Let us hope that our parental Federal Government will condescend to give us some means of expressing ourselves and to have some congressional representation in our own affairs.

I am particularly interested in another matter by virtue of an association. My father-in-law, the late Dr. Stephen E. Kramer, former assistant superintendent of the Washington public schools, was probably known to many of you. He did a splendid job, but a

neglectful Congress has given us an understaffed and poorly housed educational system. Our children should be educated in a model public-school system which should be a standard for the world.

Our fire and police departments need help. We need more modern fire-fighting equipment and the police department needs more permanent personnel. As a former assistant United States Attorney, I have marveled that the Nation's Capital of approximately 750,000 people is policed by a force of approximately 1,500 patrolmen whose job is to safeguard its citizens and their property and maintain law and order day and night. Undoubtedly the efforts of the auxiliary police have contributed in our present conditions, but we need a much larger and better equipped police department.

We have talked a great deal about local suffrage. We have had many arguments pro and con. We have heard the argument that certain minority classes might control and that politics might be harmful to the administration of the Nation's Capital. However, out of my experience as a public prosecutor and private attorney, I do not think there is a better behaved city in the world and I feel that our efficient citizen associations have shown that we are capable of self-government.

Many suggestions have been made for the approach to complete statehood. Personally, I do not care what approach is made. My idea is to get something started—do something at the present time. I have suggested to friends and I have made public speeches along the same lines, that if Congress feels we are still incapable of self-government, we should at least be entitled to the same badge of honor and dignity in the Halls of Congress as Alaska, Hawaii, and the other territories. We should at least have a congressional Delegate. I urge this because in the constant turn-over of Congress, a Delegate from the District of Columbia could at least be the means of keeping Congress advised of local problems. The Committee on the District of Columbia is constantly in a state of flux. With new Congressmen coming in, fresh ideas being constantly suggested, many congressional policies of great value are cast aside in the biennial turn-over. If we had a Delegate, we would have a clearinghouse for our ideas; we could maintain files of information and data available on all local problems; he could rise and defend our policies on the floor of Congress; he could appear before committees and he could answer interrogatories from the floor of other Members seeking information. In his presence we would have at least a spokesman and consultant for our problems.

My experience in the District of Columbia Bar Association has been that Congress has been slow to make full concessions. I have watched that process carefully in connection with our local courts. I think you can be justly proud of your municipal courts as they are now constituted. They have jurisdiction today in all civil suits up to \$3,000. I predict that before long domestic relations will also form a part of their jurisdiction and then the courts will be truly municipal in character and will administer the affairs of our community.

I repeat, let us petition Congress to have at least a congressional delegate. If that idea succeeds, let us petition them further for an elected delegate in both bodies of Congress. A spokesman in each branch would be alert to our opportunities and further our hopes. If their election disputes the contemplated abuses, then I think it would be in order to petition for full suffrage.

I want to compliment your organization; you have been a very progressive body. You have had the best interests of the District of Columbia at heart and you have always done a very good job. I say that you should now put your shoulders to the wheel and push ahead for local suffrage. I am looking forward confidently to the day in the very near future, when we will all be able to say, with the residents of every other State, that we, too, are 100 percent Americans.

#### MILITARY PREPAREDNESS—ARTICLE BY ARTHUR KROCK

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, those who served in this body before our entry into the war will, I am sure, recall that there was never effective and decisive resistance to serious requests for military preparedness. In fact, Congress was more eager to prepare the country for war than was the executive branch.

The real cleavage of opinion came largely between two groups: First, those who, although realizing the unpreparedness of the United States, thought that the security of our country could be promoted by talk; and second, those who felt that as long as we were unprepared we should indulge in as little threatening talk as possible.

In a recent article in the New York Times the distinguished journalist, Mr. Arthur Krock, makes a definitive contribution to the history of our pre-war period. With facts and figures which are incontestable he shows the desire of Congress to prepare the United States. Let us hope that some day someone will explain equally clearly the fact that many of those who saw with clarity the imminence of war delayed so long in preparing for it.

The best policy for any legislator to follow is that of personal conviction. Whether it puts him into some subtle classification as an interventionist or noninterventionist is entirely immaterial. Honesty of purpose is the important standard involved.

I ask unanimous consent that the article of Mr. Krock be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

#### THE DEFENSE AND WAR FISCAL RECORD OF CONGRESS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 25.—In the skirmishes and battles that are being and will be fought between the President and Congress, one of the causes of which is the forming fourth-term drive, several small and large obstructions to the war program can develop. But the record of Congress for the past 10 years in dealing with Presidential requests for War and Navy Department appropriations offers strong assurance that the sinew of war, which is money, will not be denied any element of growing strength that Congress can provide.

It takes much more than money, of course, to fight and win a war. But money is an indispensable supply. If the United States and Great Britain had diverted much of it into an armament race in the last decade, when the Axis Nations were making ready for the present conflict, the war—as Mr. Dooley could

have said—might have been over as soon as it began, if not before. Therefore, the congressional attitude toward defense and war appropriations is comforting to a people about to be afflicted again, and this time in the midst of desperate battle, with the wasting germs of a legislative-executive political conflict that are being incubated by the fourth-term drive.

In the 1933-42 period the record shows that Congress appropriated almost \$10,000,000,000 more for the Military Establishment than was asked in the original Presidential budgets during those years, and considerably more than the totals of the first and supplemental Budget estimates. During the same period Congress supplied almost \$1,000,000,000 more for the Naval Establishment than the President's original estimates.

#### THE DEFENSE POLICY SPLIT

There were numerous instances, which there is no space here to recount, when Members of the House and Senate sought to add to the total appropriations. These Members included A and B isolationists and noninterventionists. A isolationists were willing to spend for arms if the arms were to be used in North America; B isolationists and noninterventionists extended their concept of the defense zone of the United States to the Western Hemisphere, and after the collapse of France some of the latter accepted lend-lease as a wise necessity, clinging only to their demand that we keep out of the war.

The attack of the Japanese on Pearl Harbor, followed by the declaration of war against this Nation by the other two Axis Powers, ended the argument and merged the disputants. But it is worth remembering that the argument was not over money to arm the forces of the United States. And there is no reason to think that, except to achieve obvious economies to promote efficiency, Congress will engage in any such argument for the duration.

The subjoined comparison is between the President's original Budget estimates for the last decade and the sums granted by Congress. A considerable part of the difference is accounted for by supplemental Budget requests from the Executive. But it is accurate to say that, as a general rule, and particularly in the last 3 years, Congress has given more to the Military and Naval Establishments than the President sought.

In the following table the first figure is the amount of the original Budget estimates and the second is the amount appropriated, all in millions of dollars:

War Department (1933), \$301, \$304½; (1934), \$280½, \$378; (1935), \$289, \$292½; (1936), \$320½, \$368½; (1937), \$391, \$420; (1938), \$428½, \$514; (1939), \$618½, \$648; (1940), \$869, \$879½; (1941), \$11,202, \$13,469; (1942), \$71,723, \$75,610. For the current fiscal year the President's first budget was for \$9,532 and the House reported favorably on \$42,820.

Navy Department (1933), \$354½, \$334½; (1934), \$323½, \$572½; (1935), \$295½, \$371½; (1936), \$468, 498½; (1937), \$561½, 559; (1938), \$577½, 588½; (1939), \$579½, \$656½; (1940), \$1,028, \$1,050; (1941), \$4,460, \$4,506; (1942), \$23,810, \$24,085. And for the current fiscal year the congressional bills have already provided for almost a billion more for the Navy than the original estimates.

#### THE GRAND TOTALS

The grand totals for the period, as affecting the War Department, including the amount reported by the House for 1943, are: \$125,962 estimated, \$135,642 voted. For the Navy Department the totals are: \$46,427 estimated, \$47,948 voted.

To further point out the fact that the issue over intervention was not an issue over



armament for national defense, it should be noted that Senator Lodge, a noninterventionist, urged compulsory military training some months before the President endorsed it, and is now an ardent supporter of the plan to raise the Army to 8,200,000 officers and men in 1943. Some of his other activities are typical. He voted in 1941 to confine our forces to the Western Hemisphere. But he voted "yes" for 21 percent naval expansion in 1938, for 6,000 versus 5,500 Army planes in 1939, for lend-lease and its \$7,000,000,000 appropriation in 1941, for the 18-month extension of military service in 1941, and against the provision to compel 1 year's training of the 18- and 19-year-olds before they could be assigned to combat areas.

#### ALIENS IN LABOR—ADDRESS BY SENATOR REYNOLDS

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* a radio address on the subject Aliens in Labor, delivered by him, Friday, February 26, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE SIZE OF OUR ARMY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR GREEN

[Mr. GURNEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* a radio address on the subject The Size of Our Army, delivered by Senator Green, on February 25, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE HOUSING STUDY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR TAFT

[Mr. TAFT asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* an address entitled "The Housing Study," delivered by him to the National Association of Housing Officials at Richmond, Va., on February 24, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY PRESIDENT QUEZON TO HIS COUNTRYMEN

[Mr. TYDINGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* a radio address delivered by President Manuel Quezon to his countrymen on the anniversary of his departure from Corregidor, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY UNDER SECRETARY OF WAR AT DINNER OF PRODUCE FOR VICTORY COMMITTEE

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* an address delivered by Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Under Secretary of War, before a dinner meeting of the produce-for-victory committee of the Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce of February 23, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### GEORGE WASHINGTON DINNER ADDRESS BY EUGENE S. CASEY

[Mr. HATCH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* a Washington Day address delivered by Hon. Eugene B. Casey at Albuquerque, N. Mex., on February 26, 1942, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### UNITED WAR AIMS AND STRATEGY—ADDRESS BY LOTHROP STODDARD

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* a radio address on the subject United War Aims and Strategy, delivered by Lothrop Stoddard, February 14, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PUBLIC RELATIONS BUREAU—EDITORIAL FROM NORRISTOWN (PA.) TIMES-HERALD

[Mr. NYE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* an editorial entitled "Congress Needs Public Relations Bureau," from the Norristown (Pa.) Times-Herald of February 15, 1943, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### RICKENBACKER CHALLENGED BY FELLOW HERO OF WAR—ARTICLE FROM PHILADELPHIA RECORD

[Mr. GUFFEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* an article appearing under a New York date line of February 28 entitled "Rickenbacker Challenged by Fellow Hero of War," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### JOINT COMMITTEE ON WAR PROBLEMS—EDITORIAL FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES

[Mr. MALONEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* an editorial from the New York Times of February 21, 1943, entitled "Congress' Two Glass Houses" and S. Con. Res. 2, which appear in the Appendix.]

#### MONOPOLY AND DESECRATION—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY OKLAHOMAN

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* an editorial entitled "Monopoly and Desecration," published in the Daily Oklahoman, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### IN SOILED ERMINE—EDITORIAL FROM THE DAILY OKLAHOMAN

[Mr. MOORE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* an editorial entitled "In Soiled Ermine," published in the Daily Oklahoman, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### BILLIONAIRE BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

[Mr. BONE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the *RECORD* an article by Gilbert E. Busch, United Press staff correspondent, containing figures regarding the size of certain business organizations in the United States, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### TRANSPORTATION OF PETROLEUM BY PIPE LINE

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution coming over from a previous day, which will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 103) submitted by Mr. CLARK of Missouri (for himself, Mr. REED, Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. MOORE, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. BURTON, Mr. WHERRY, and Mr. CAPPER) on February 15, 1943, was read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for an explanation of the resolution.

Mr. BARKLEY. This resolution is to go over without prejudice.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be passed over. ORDER DISPENSING WITH CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The routine morning business is concluded, and the calendar, under rule VIII, is in order.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the call of the calendar be dispensed with.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### INCREASE IN PAY OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 17.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 17) to provide for a temporary adjust-

ment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and to insert the following:

That any officer or member of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, or the Fire Department of the District of Columbia, whose rate of compensation is governed by the act of July 1, 1930 (Public Law No. 489 of the 71st Cong.), shall be paid additional compensation at a rate of \$350 per annum: *Provided*, That each such employee shall be paid only such additional compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of \$5,000 per annum.

Sec. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and shall remain in effect for the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, during the month of December last, Congress passed a bill providing for an increase of \$300 for each fireman and policeman in service in the District of Columbia. The bill was vetoed by the President, on two specific grounds. One ground was that the bill did not take care of another group in the District, namely, the school teachers. The other ground was that it contained a retroactive feature, that it extended back 1 year. In other words, in the bill passed in December last it was provided that the increases in pay should be retroactive to December 1941. It will be noted that the bill now under consideration provides that the increases shall be retroactive to December 1942 only.

Following the President's veto, the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia introduced a bill providing for an increase of pay for the members of the police force and the members of the fire department amounting to \$480 a year. As a result of the hearings on the bill, the chairman of the committee changed the amount from \$480 a year as the increase for a year to \$350 a year for each member of the respective services for the duration of the war. In other words, we reduced the amount provided by the initial bill which was introduced, and set up what we thought was a fair amount of additional pay for the police and fire services for the duration of the war.

We worked the matter out in various ways, but came to the conclusion that a flat sum of \$350 for each member would be fair, because by making such provision we would increase the wages in the lower brackets, so that policemen who were receiving only \$1,900 a year would receive an increase sufficient to warrant them remaining in the service.

For the enlightenment of the Senate, I wish to present some figures on the subject which I think very much worth while.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield before he states the figures?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. OVERTON. What was the basis for the increase? Was it recommended because of the increased cost of living?

Mr. McCARRAN. The principal basis is the increased cost of living.

Mr. OVERTON. That is why there is suggested a flat increase of \$350 a year for the members of each service?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is a fact, and it is also because of the increased service demanded of the police and fire departments at this time.

Mr. OVERTON. That is equally distributed?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is equally distributed.

Mr. OVERTON. That is why the increases are the same?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. In other words, we believe that those who receive the smaller salaries, namely, \$1,900 a year, which is the entrance salary in the police service and the fire service, should be taken care of, because it has been from that element that we have been losing a greater number of policemen and firemen. One thousand nine hundred dollars a year is not sufficient to sustain a family of four people in the District of Columbia, according to the facts and figures presented by the Department of Labor.

In order that Senators may know exactly what will happen if the bill shall become law, let me say that six employees in the police service will receive \$4,850. They are now receiving \$4,500. Mind you, there are only six in that category. They will receive an increase of 7.5 percent.

Eighteen of the employees now receiving \$3,600 will receive \$3,950, or an increase of 9.7 percent.

Forty-five of the police force now receiving \$3,050 per annum will receive \$3,400, or an increase of 11.4 percent.

Sixty-three of the police force now receiving \$2,750 will receive \$3,100, or an increase of 12.7 percent.

Seven hundred and eighty-eight of the police force now receiving \$2,400 will, if the bill shall become law, receive \$2,750, or an increase of 14.5 percent.

Sixty-one members of the police force now receiving \$2,300 will receive under the proposed law \$2,650, or an increase of 15.2 percent.

Fifty-four members of the police force now receiving \$2,200 will receive \$2,550, or an increase of 15.9 percent.

Eighty-six members of the police force now receiving \$2,100 will receive \$2,450, or an increase of 16.6 percent.

One hundred and seventy-eight members of the police force receiving \$2,000 will, under the proposed law, receive \$2,350, or an increase of 17.5 percent.

Three hundred and sixty-three members of the police force of the District of Columbia now receiving \$1,900 per annum will receive \$2,250, or an increase of 18.4 percent.

The total number of policemen authorized by act of Congress for the District of Columbia is 1,711. According to the figures, there is now a shortage of about 41 privates. There is now a greater shortage in the lower grade, the vacancies in the list of privates being

77. In other words, the quota which is allowed by law cannot be filled, notwithstanding the fact that there is a greater need for police service than ever in the history of Washington. The reason for inability to fill the quota in the lower grade is the entrance salary of \$1,900, which extends over the whole year. Therefore, we thought best and we think best that this bill should carry a flat \$350 raise for all those receiving as high as \$4,500 a year, but in no case would anyone receive in excess of \$5,000.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Is the bill approved by the District Commissioners?

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill was not approved by the District Commissioners. No bill increasing salaries, with which I have had anything to do, has been approved by the District Commissioners. In answer to the Senator's question I wish to read from the testimony of the Chairman of the District Commissioners before the committee. Mr. Young, Chairman of the District Commissioners, testified in a hearing on this bill, when the bill contained a provision for \$480 per annum increase in place of \$350 per annum. I read from his testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. While you are on your feet, Mr. Mayor, will you tell us what you think about this bill?

Commissioner YOUNG. Well, Senator, it puts me in a very peculiar position, not a very happy one.

The CHAIRMAN. You testified voluntarily. Now, I can cross-examine you, because you submitted yourself.

Commissioner YOUNG. Well, I think you easily guess, and every man in the room can guess it doesn't put me in a very pleasant position, because I am very proud of the force. I think I, personally, since I have been on the job, have appointed about 700 of them. That is a pretty large part of the force, and without trying to flatter the major too much—

Referring to Major Kelly—

I think the force shows a great improvement, to such an extent I think the citizens now are praising it, where, not so many years ago they were critical. The police force has done a great job, and nobody will dispute the fact that they deserve a raise. I wish I could sit right here at this table and sign my name to the money this bill calls for.

That statement was made when the bill carried a provision for an increase of \$480 per annum. Commissioner Young then said he wished he could sit at the committee table and sign his name to the increase the bill calls for.

Later on, after the hearings had been held, and upon further consideration, we thought it best to reduce the amount to \$350 per annum, a flat allowance to all members of the force then receiving under \$4,500 a year.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I understand from the Senator that the Commissioners as a body are opposed to the measure which the Senator is submitting, but are they opposed to any increase in the pay scales?

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know that I would be justified in saying they are opposed to any increase, but they have opposed every increase which has been

submitted. They opposed the proposal for a \$300 increase which was contained in the bill passed by the Senate last December. Senators will find from the RECORD that I stated to the Senate at that time that the Commissioners were opposed to the increase. They oppose the present proposed increase. As between two bills, that is a substitute measure which will be proposed in the Senate, and the one which is offered by the committee, I am advised that the Commissioners favor the substitute. The substitute would raise the salaries of those in the lower brackets \$100 per annum, and raise the salaries in the higher brackets \$300 per annum. In other words, the substitute bill would give a greater increase to those in the higher brackets, and a lesser increase to those in the lower brackets. Yet it is in the very low brackets where we are losing the men, because they cannot live on the present salaries.

For the further enlightenment of the able Senator from Michigan I wish to read a letter.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. OVERTON. Do the Commissioners approve or disapprove the substitute bill or have they made a report in respect to it?

Mr. McCARRAN. I am advised that the Commissioners approve the substitute bill which has been mentioned and which I think the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] will present. I have just referred to the substitute, which proposes to give an increase in salary of \$100 a year to those in the \$1,900-a-year bracket and \$300 a year increase to those who are in higher pay brackets.

Mr. OVERTON. May I ask the Senator why the Commissioners approve the substitute bill rather than the original bill? Is it because the substitute bill carries less increase in the aggregate?

Mr. McCARRAN. That would be my conjecture, because the substitute bill carries a maximum of \$300 increase in place of \$350.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me before the letter to which he referred is read?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am merely seeking information. I do not know what the facts are about the proposed increase, except what the Senator has just said. In the Post Office Department, however, we have a tentative understanding that the employees shall receive an increase of \$300 each. I think it is quite generally agreed or understood that that is what the increase will be, and that is acceptable to the employees. I wonder whether it would not be well to make the increase given to employees generally about the same? I am merely suggesting that thought to the Senator.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall discuss that matter, I will say to the Senator from Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read a letter which addresses itself largely to the question



propounded by the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG].

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the letter will be read.

The CHIEF CLERK read as follows:

FALLS CHURCH, VA., January 25, 1943.

Senator PAT McCARRAN,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am a private in the Metropolitan Police Department, Washington, D. C. I noticed in the Sunday Star paper where Senator BURTON, of Ohio, is to file another police and fire pay bill in the Senate with the one you have introduced but at a lower scale.

I suppose we all have our ups and downs, so I will give you a few of mine. We have five children and did live in Washington, but cost of living growing so high I thought it best to move out, so moved to Falls Church, Va., which did not reduce our cost of living at all. We live very simple, depriving ourselves and children of many a want. The children spend very little for shows and such things children want, and my wife and myself spend nothing only for necessities. We can't clothe ourselves or children as they should be, but we do have enough to eat even if it is simple food and have to leave off other things. I have tried to save the best I could for war bonds and stamps, but the best we have done is one \$25 bond and the children have six or seven dollars each in stamps. We know our country needs all each one can do, so we will do the best we can, but we do have to live. I don't want this letter considered as a complaint but merely a statement of existing conditions.

I'm planning on a garden this spring which will help a lot, but with the high cost of shoes, clothing, foods, and other living expenses, it's impossible to live and pay my bills at my present salary.

If we were allowed to do extra work at other places, it would give us a little extra money to pay our bills with. We work many hours overtime, but do not get any pay for it.

I think the bill you introduced is small enough, and will help the whole department a lot even if it does not meet each of our needs, but anything less will just make it that much harder for us to live. There are lots of other men in the Police Department who have as large a family as I, and some larger. So what you can do for the department will be greatly appreciated by my family and myself and lots of other families.

JUST A POLICEMAN.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] propounded a question to me and then was called from the Chamber. He has asked me to defer making answer to his question until he returns, which I will gladly do.

The Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] a moment ago raised the question of the cost of living in the District of Columbia. The cost of living is somewhat connected with the question propounded by the Senator from Tennessee. In other words, it will not do to compare the cost of living in the District of Columbia with the cost of living elsewhere, because it is higher in the District of Columbia than it is in any other comparable city in the United States.

I beg leave to read an article from the local press which carries confirmation of my last statement. The article is headed:

District cost of living rises 7½ percent in a year.

The article continues—

District living costs advanced 0.3 percent between December 15 and January 15, as compared with an average rise of 0.2 percent in other large cities during the same period and now are 7.5 percent higher than a year ago and 19.8 percent above the level of December 15, 1940—

I draw that especially to the attention of those who are interested in this subject, and I repeat what the article states, that District living costs now are 19.8 percent above the level of December 15, 1940—

the Labor Department reported today—

This was just a few days ago—

Food costs in the District increased 0.8 percent during the month, and fuel, electricity, and ice 1.9 percent. Prices of clothing and housefurnishings dropped fractionally, while costs of miscellaneous items remained unchanged. As an economy measure, the Labor Department made no survey of rents in January.

The January advance brought the District cost of living index to 119.4 percent of the 1935-39 average.

That is a matter which takes the consideration of the pay which should be given to the policemen and firemen of the District of Columbia out of the category of comparison with any other city in the country. The reason for that is obvious. There has been an influx of hundreds of thousands of people into the District. In Washington we have the greatest pay roll of any city in all the world, and the cost of living is constantly increasing. The cost of living is so high that it will absorb any increase in pay. That appears to me to be one of the reasons for the continuation of the high cost of living in the District.

I do not like to touch upon a phase of the subject which would be in answer to

the question of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] until he has returned to the Chamber. However, I will say that we cannot compare the pay of policemen or members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia with that of members of the Postal Service because the pay received by those engaged in the Postal Service is governed by the Nation-wide cost of living, whereas the pay of men who work in the Police and Fire Departments of the District of Columbia is governed by a cost of living which is entirely localized and belongs entirely to the city of Washington.

Let me say further, in answer to the statement of the Senator from Louisiana, that I have in my hand a report of the Bureau of Labor Statistics of the United States which dwells upon the increased cost of living in the various cities. Leaving out the fractions, I read from the table, as follows:

Atlanta, total, \$1,556; food, \$609; clothing, \$197; housing, \$291; fuel and light, \$96; furniture, furnishings, and household equipment, \$36.

Going through a long list, we come to the city of Washington.

We find the cost of living in Washington to be the highest in the United States for a four-person manual worker's family at maintenance level as defined by the Work Projects Administration.

The total is \$1,731; food, \$622; clothing, \$220; housing, \$352; fuel and light, \$119; furniture, furnishings, household equipment, \$44; miscellaneous, \$372.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD at this point the entire table, because it deals with the subject under discussion.

There being no objection, the table was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE 1.—Estimated<sup>1</sup> cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level as defined by the Work Projects Administration,<sup>2</sup> in 33 large cities as of Sept. 15, 1942

City	Total	Food	Clothing	Housing	Fuel and light	Furniture, furnishings, household equipment	Miscellaneous
Atlanta	\$1,556.93	\$609.95	\$197.56	\$291.25	\$96.35	\$36.62	\$325.20
Baltimore	1,566.34	616.90	206.41	254.94	107.21	44.58	336.30
Birmingham	1,518.13	608.11	212.58	243.58	74.27	38.15	341.44
Boston	1,657.86	606.51	206.40	272.33	151.57	39.21	381.84
Buffalo	1,558.10	595.30	212.77	259.74	113.61	40.17	336.51
Chicago	1,691.04	614.36	194.36	306.52	133.15	38.32	404.33
Cincinnati	1,587.74	608.60	222.24	276.02	98.17	43.47	339.24
Cleveland	1,645.12	595.21	222.78	303.97	115.82	40.52	366.82
Denver	1,521.68	586.81	201.87	243.27	114.18	39.16	336.69
Detroit	1,686.50	602.14	207.43	325.24	123.40	38.01	390.19
Indianapolis	1,611.88	578.33	197.62	249.56	85.39	40.72	360.26
Jacksonville	1,528.86	584.45	195.28	253.91	99.74	40.45	355.03
Kansas City	1,564.29	634.28	183.90	237.46	113.63	39.49	355.63
Los Angeles	1,467.25	576.63	208.72	220.61	111.69	38.84	310.76
Manchester	1,574.91	600.77	209.67	250.56	71.07	41.14	401.70
Memphis	1,594.06	631.68	194.59	200.57	178.40	39.05	349.77
Minneapolis	1,567.03	594.49	226.68	287.64	89.71	42.65	325.86
Milwaukee	1,614.07	578.72	175.00	304.42	128.10	38.11	389.72
Mobile	1,622.46	588.42	202.75	311.54	140.53	38.81	340.41
New Orleans	1,433.72	618.00	196.27	193.45	83.17	40.16	302.04
New York	1,820.33	630.88	205.63	215.06	70.88	45.02	352.86
Norfolk	1,722.72	650.48	206.30	311.04	128.12	41.05	385.73
Philadelphia	1,624.41	637.43	216.26	261.94	111.96	41.85	354.97
Pittsburgh	1,606.76	612.26	209.77	291.58	94.85	40.62	357.68
Portland, Maine	1,600.26	622.50	201.18	212.19	167.47	39.97	356.95
Portland, Oregon	1,616.41	642.81	196.47	206.58	161.44	41.13	367.98
Richmond	1,562.58	586.87	212.02	257.86	108.73	42.29	354.81
St. Louis	1,617.94	616.26	201.07	296.65	114.13	43.06	346.77

<sup>1</sup> See explanation of method given on pp. 1 and 2.

<sup>2</sup> See the Works Progress Administration publication, Intercity Differences in Costs of Living in March 1935 59 cities, Research Monograph XII, for the items included in the maintenance budget.

TABLE 1.—Estimated cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level as defined by the Work Projects Administration, in 33 large cities as of Sept. 15, 1942—Continued

City	Total	Food	Clothing	Housing	Fuel and light	Furniture, furnishings, household equipment	Miscellaneous
San Francisco.....	\$1,717.18	\$642.51	\$210.03	\$291.78	\$87.18	\$43.55	\$442.13
Scranton.....	1,576.36	612.49	199.95	265.24	98.26	39.75	360.67
Seattle.....	1,643.09	649.28	213.92	201.42	127.98	42.61	407.88
Washington, D. C.....	1,731.88	622.06	220.69	352.10	119.82	44.29	372.92

TABLE 2.—Estimated<sup>1</sup> indexes of cost of living for a 4-person manual worker's family at maintenance level<sup>2</sup> in 33 large cities as of Sept. 15, 1942, on a base of the cost in Washington, D. C., as of that date as 100

City	Total	Food	Clothing	Housing	Fuel and light	Furniture, furnishings, household equipment	Miscellaneous
Atlanta.....	89.9	98.1	89.5	82.7	80.4	82.7	87.2
Baltimore.....	90.4	99.2	93.5	72.4	89.5	100.7	90.2
Birmingham.....	87.7	97.8	96.3	69.2	62.0	86.1	91.6
Boston.....	95.7	97.5	93.5	77.3	126.5	88.5	102.4
Buffalo.....	90.0	95.7	96.4	73.8	94.8	90.7	90.2
Chicago.....	97.6	98.8	88.1	87.1	111.1	86.5	108.4
Cincinnati.....	91.7	97.8	100.7	78.4	81.9	98.1	91.0
Cleveland.....	95.0	95.7	100.9	86.3	96.7	91.5	98.4
Denver.....	87.9	94.3	91.5	69.1	95.3	88.4	90.3
Detroit.....	97.4	96.8	94.0	92.4	103.1	85.8	104.6
Houston.....	87.3	93.0	89.5	70.9	71.3	91.9	96.6
Indianapolis.....	88.3	94.0	88.5	72.1	83.2	91.3	95.2
Jacksonville.....	90.3	102.0	83.3	67.4	94.8	89.2	95.3
Kansas City.....	84.7	92.7	94.6	62.7	93.2	87.7	83.3
Los Angeles.....	90.9	96.6	95.0	71.2	59.3	92.9	107.7
Manchester.....	92.0	101.5	88.2	57.0	148.9	88.2	93.8
Memphis.....	90.5	95.6	102.7	81.7	74.9	96.3	87.4
Milwaukee.....	93.2	93.0	79.3	86.5	106.9	86.0	104.5
Minneapolis.....	93.7	94.6	91.9	88.5	117.3	87.6	91.3
Mobile.....	82.8	99.4	88.9	55.0	69.4	90.7	81.1
New Orleans.....	87.8	101.4	93.2	61.1	59.2	101.6	94.6
New York.....	99.5	104.6	93.5	88.3	106.9	92.7	103.4
Norfolk.....	93.8	102.5	98.0	74.4	93.4	94.5	95.2
Philadelphia.....	90.7	98.6	95.5	75.3	88.6	89.9	89.9
Pittsburgh.....	92.8	98.4	95.1	82.8	79.2	91.7	95.9
Portland, Maine.....	92.4	100.1	91.2	60.3	139.8	90.2	95.7
Portland, Ore.....	93.3	103.3	89.0	58.7	134.7	92.9	98.7
Richmond.....	90.2	94.3	96.1	73.2	90.7	95.5	95.1
St. Louis.....	93.4	99.1	91.1	84.3	95.3	97.2	93.0
San Francisco.....	99.2	103.3	95.2	82.9	72.8	98.3	118.6
Scranton.....	91.0	98.5	90.6	75.3	82.0	89.7	96.7
Seattle.....	94.9	104.4	96.9	57.2	105.8	96.2	109.4
Washington, D. C.....	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

<sup>1</sup> See explanation of method on pp. 1 and 2.

<sup>2</sup> See the Works Progress Administration publication, *Intercity Differences in Cost of Living in March 1935*, 59 Cities, Research Monograph XII, for the items included in the maintenance budget.

Mr. McCARRAN. I return again to the reason for the proposed increase to employees of the fire department and the police department, which question was raised by the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON].

On February 23, 1942, the Secretary of Labor reported on continuing studies made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. I read some of the high lights of the Secretary's report.

In the 8 months from May 12, 1942, to January 12, 1943, the national average cost of all foods rose 9.4 percent.

On January 12 the national index of food costs stood 33 percent above the 1935-39 averages, and 14 percent above the figures for 1942. Prices of clothing and household furnishings of the type purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers in large cities of the United States have skyrocketed amazingly.

In the field of men's clothing the Secretary of Labor reports that between September 15, 1939, and January 15, 1943, the price of work trousers increased over 37 percent.

The price of cotton overalls increased over 47 percent. The price of cotton work shirts increased over 51 percent. Other price increases for specific articles of men's clothing were:

Business shirts, 30 percent; street shoes, 28 percent; work shoes, 32 percent; topcoats, 32 percent; overcoats, 20 percent; wool suits, 30 percent.

In the field of home furnishings the following increases were reported: Inexpensive living-room suites, 40 percent; medium bedroom suites, 24 percent; sheets, 52 percent; wool blankets, 23 percent.

These figures are averages for 21 large cities of the United States, but they are probably to be considered an index of average price changes in Washington as indicated by the fact that the average change in the cost of all goods purchased by wage earners and lower-salaried workers in the 21 cities between September 1939 and January 1943 was 19.8 percent, which is exactly the same percentage rise reported for goods of the same grades during the same period in Washington, D. C.

I do not desire to detain the Senate. I was hoping that the Senator from Tennessee would return to the Chamber. I must now dwell upon the question which he propounded, namely, in view of the fact there is a proposal to increase the pay of postal workers by a flat \$300 per annum, would it not be well to have a uniform increase of \$300? A portion of my last statement was in answer to that very proposal.

The increased cost of living in the District of Columbia is far in excess of what it is in other cities of the country. Pay raises for postal employees, if granted by Congress, will be covered in legislation concerned only with that subject.

Why should the provisions of Senate bill 17 affect the provisions of Senate bill 360? If one bill affects the other, it must be clear that the two bills interact.

As presently drawn, Senate bill 360 grants a flat increase of \$300 to postal employees throughout the Nation. The cost-of-living index for the Nation is lower than for the District of Columbia. It is not the contention of the proponents of the committee amendment to Senate bill 17 that action taken in behalf of postal employees should even be considered by the Senate in connection with its deliberations on Senate bill 17; but if this claim is made by the proponents of the minority substitute for Senate bill 17, then they must accept the logical conclusion that if postal employees are entitled to a flat increase of \$300 on the basis of the Nation-wide cost-of-living index, then the higher cost-of-living index in the District of Columbia justifies a flat increase greater than \$300 for policemen and firemen in the District. It should be stressed that whereas Senate bill 360 provides an increase of \$300 for postal employees in the lower salary grades, Senate bill 17 would give the policemen and firemen of the District in the lowest salary grades an increase of \$350. The proposed minority substitute for Senate bill 17 would limit police and fire department employees in the District in the lower salary grades to an increase of only \$100 a year, which is barely 5 percent above their present rates of pay.

As I understand, the difference between the substitute which will be offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] and the bill which has been reported by the committee is a difference of \$50. The substitute would give an increase of \$100 a year to the lowest paid in the service.

Mr. President, the lowest paid are the ones who suffer the most. The person who wrote the letter to the chairman of the District Committee is a man with a family of four, including himself. He can scarcely get along on \$1,900. Many are refusing to take service in the District of Columbia police force because \$1,900 per annum is not a living wage under the existing cost of living in the District.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I apologize to the Senator from Tennessee. I delayed the answer to his question as long as I thought I could. I will state it again if the Senator cares to hear it.



Mr. McKELLAR. I should be glad to have the Senator from Nevada do so. I should like, however, to make a further statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. I should like to have the Senator from Tennessee make his statement now.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am glad to do so.

The Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads came to the conclusion that a flat increase of \$300 for postal employees was probably the best way to solve the problem. The increased cost of living is given as the reason for the increase, is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am inclined to agree with the Senator from Nevada to that extent.

What I rose to say is that I believe it would be better if our action on all these matters were as nearly uniform as possible, making the increases about the same. I submit that suggestion for the Senator's consideration.

I do not know the situation in the District, and I cannot speak with regard to it. However, I think we should give the employees of the Government whose living expenses have risen a reasonable increase. We did so during the last war, and we might well do so in the present war. We are doing so now, and should continue to do so after the 1st of April.

Mr. McCARRAN. At the hazard of repetition, because of my very high regard for the opinion of the Senator from Tennessee, and because he is chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, which has in hand the matter of an increase in pay for employees of the Postal Service, I desire to read an article published quite recently in the local press, and which is correct:

District living costs advanced 0.3 percent between December 15 and January 15, as compared with an average rise of 0.2 percent in other large cities during the same period, and now are 7.5 percent higher than a year ago and 19.8 percent above the level of December 15, 1940, the Labor Department reported today.

Food costs in the District increased 0.8 percent during the month, and fuel, electricity, and ice 1.9 percent. Prices of clothing and house furnishings dropped fractionally, while costs of miscellaneous items remained unchanged. As an economy measure, the Labor Department made no survey of rents in January.

The January advance brought the District cost-of-living index to 119.4 percent of the 1935-39 average.

During the single month between December 15, 1942, and January 15, 1943, the cost of food in Washington rose eight-tenths of 1 percent, or at the rate of approximately 10 percent a year. Only 6 of the 21 major cities showed greater percentage increase in the cost of food. During the same month, the cost of fuel, electricity and ice in Washington increased 1.9 percent (at the rate of approximately 23 percent per year). This was the second largest increase reported among the 21 major cities of the country.

On January 15, 1943, the cost of food in Washington stood approximately 34 percent above the 1935-39 average. The cost of clothing in Washington was approximately 32 percent above the 1935-39 average. The cost of house furnishings stood exactly 29 percent above the 1935-39 average.

I dwell on that in answer to the Senator's observation that it is not fair to judge what should be a proper pay in-

crease for the employees of the District of Columbia on the basis of what the Senator may find to be a proper increase for a group which extends around the United States; because the cost of living in the District of Columbia, as shown by the figures quoted—figures taken from reports by the Department of Labor—is far out of line with the cost of living in any other comparable city in the United States. I dwell on the matter for another reason, as well: I think comparisons are not fair; but if we were to make comparisons at all, there is no comparison between the groups with which we are dealing and the postal employees group. The police force in the District of Columbia—especially in the District of Columbia, where the police force has been cut down yearly—is now some 77 men short because of inability to get a sufficient number of men to serve at the salary we are paying them, and in the District the police force is called upon for greater activity and greater service than it ever before has been called upon, or for which the police force in any other city is called upon at the present time. Generally speaking, it is not fair to compare a policeman's salary with that of any other Federal employee, because a policeman on duty has no fixed hours of labor. He must remain on duty; he is subject to call at all times. The same statement applies to a fireman. Even though a policeman or a fireman may have a day off, he is subject to call at all times, and must stand by and hold himself in readiness. That situation does not prevail with reference to any Federal services other than the Police Department and the Fire Department; and of course I am dealing now entirely with the District of Columbia.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I do not propose to disagree with the Senator as to much that he says. I do not know that I shall disagree with him at all. There is a great deal to be said in favor of the position he takes. I desire to ask the Senator if he has any figures showing how much more the cost of living has increased in Washington than it has elsewhere in the entire country generally. If he has figures of that kind, it seems to me they would be helpful to us in this matter.

Mr. McCARRAN. I hope that the information I have at hand, and which I have prepared along the very line of the Senator's request, may help enlighten the Senator in that respect.

Mr. McKELLAR. I should be very glad to have the information. I should think that it might be very helpful to have a comparison between the general average throughout the country, outside the metropolitan district of Washington, and the situation in Washington.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me state something which may assist in that connection: In the city of Baltimore, the starting salary for a policeman is \$1,825. The top salary is \$2,086. The increase between 1938 and 1942 was \$255. The increase for the top salary was \$296. That is the increase between those years.

So at present the initial salary is \$2,080, and the top salary is \$2,382. The living cost differential between Washington and Baltimore is \$151; that is to say, the cost in Washington is \$151 higher than in Baltimore.

In Boston, another comparable city, the starting salary is \$1,600. The top salary is \$2,100. There, as in the city of Washington, the police force has had no increase for many years. The differential between the cost of living in Boston and the cost of living in Washington is \$60, the lesser cost being in Boston.

In Buffalo the differential in the cost of living is \$173.

In Cincinnati the differential is \$130.

In Cleveland the differential is \$86.

In Detroit the differential is \$45.

In Los Angeles the differential is \$157.

In Milwaukee the differential is \$117.

In Minneapolis the differential is \$109.

In Newark the differential—closest to that of Washington—is \$9.

In New Orleans the differential is \$211.

In Philadelphia the differential is \$161.

In Pittsburgh the differential is \$125.

In St. Louis the differential is \$100.

In San Francisco the differential is \$14.

In Kansas City the differential is \$264.

In most of the cities I have named an increase has been given within the past few years to the members of the police force; whereas, as a matter of fact, since 1930 no increase has been accorded to those serving in the police service in the District of Columbia.

I shall not detain the Senate longer on this matter, because I take it that the Senator from Ohio, in opposition to a \$50 item in the increase, will present his proposal in line with the minority views.

Let me say to the Senate that approximately a year ago hearings were held in the House on the matter of an increase of \$300 for the members of the police and fire departments of the District of Columbia. The bill came to the Senate, was referred to the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, and was held in that committee until late in the year. Then it was reported to the Senate, and finally was passed by the Senate and passed by the other body, but was vetoed by the President. The reasons for his veto were, not that he did not favor an increase in pay for the members of the police force and fire department but rather that the bill left out a great group of employees in the District of Columbia—namely, the teachers—and, rather, because it carried a provision that the increase should be retroactive for 1 full year—namely, from December 1942 to December 1941.

In other words, if the bill had been signed by the President and had become law, instead of having received the President's veto, those who would have received the increase would have received it from December 1941.

The present bill is retroactive only to December 1942.

Mr. President, it seems to me that the whole thought on the subject must center on the practical application. There is authorization whereby the District of Columbia can have seventeen-hundred-odd policemen. However, it is impossible

to obtain 1,700; and today there are only approximately 1,600 policemen in the District of Columbia. The turn-over during a year is about 500. The reason for that is that the men are lured away to cities where they receive better wages, where there are better living conditions, where the cost of living is lower, and where the wages are higher. So they will not stay here even for 1 full year or for 2 years. They even give up the security incident to their jobs here in order to go to places where wages are higher.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. As I understand, the Senator's position is that, assuming, let us say, that a general increase of \$300 for post office employees, for instance, is a fair and just increase, and that an additional \$50, or an increase of \$350, for the police force of the District of Columbia would be in substantial line with the \$300 increase for postal employees throughout the country, the difference between the cost of living in Washington and in other places throughout the remainder of the country would about take care of the difference of \$50 in favor of the policemen, according to the Senator's bill. Is that an approximately correct statement of the Senator's argument?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is one way of stating it. I think it could be stated in another way, and yet carry the same thought. The cost of living in the District of Columbia is much higher than it is in other places. I do not stand on the position that \$300 is sufficient for Postal Service employees; I am inclined to believe—and I am very emphatic in my belief—that they should receive much more than \$300. I do not say that \$350 is a fair increase for the District police and the District firemen. I do not think it is fair; I think it should be more. I introduced a bill to provide an increase of \$480 a year, but I was convinced from the hearings and from the conditions precedent that I could not get that bill through, however just the \$480 increase was, however right it was, however fair it was. So, in order to get through what I thought was merely partially fair and partially reasonable, I changed the bill so as to provide an increase of \$350.

If \$300 is fair for the Postal Service employees, then, indeed, the members of the police department and of the fire department of the District of Columbia should have far more than \$350, and \$50 is little enough as a differential between the two classes of services, in view of the cost of living within the District of Columbia.

Mr. President, I desire to insert in the Record at this point, amplifying the statement I have made, a chart showing the amount of salary increase, 1938-42, to police departments and fire departments in various cities of the country.

I also ask that there be inserted in the Record a chart from which I read showing the differential in the cost of living in the various cities.

There being no objection, the tables were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Amount salary increases, 1938-42

City	Police department		Fire department	
	Start	Top	Start	Top
Philadelphia.....	\$400	\$400	\$225	\$200
Detroit.....	None	264	220	None
Los Angeles.....	240	300	240	300
Cleveland.....	None	525	None	525
Baltimore.....	255	296	None	100
St. Louis.....	None	None	240	240
Boston.....	None	None	None	None
Pittsburgh.....	None	115	82	115
Washington, D. C.....	None	None	None	None
San Francisco.....	240	300	240	400
Milwaukee.....	180	180	60	60
Buffalo.....	50	50	None	None
New Orleans.....	115	115	146	146
Minneapolis.....	None	120	None	None
Cincinnati.....	144	264	None	120
Newark.....	(1)	(1)	None	500
Kansas City.....	(1)	180	140	120

<sup>1</sup> No figures.

Police salaries

City	Population gain or loss, percent	Salaries 1938		Increases, 1938-42		Present salaries		Living cost differential <sup>1</sup>	Present salaries plus living cost differential	
		Start	Top	Start	Top	Start	Top		Start	Top
Baltimore.....	4.5	\$1,825	\$2,086	\$255.00	\$296	\$2,080.00	\$2,382	\$151	\$2,231.00	\$2,533
Boston.....	— .8	1,600	2,100			1,600.00	2,100	60	1,660.00	2,160
Buffalo.....	.8	1,900	2,200	50.00	50	1,950.00	2,250	173	2,123.00	2,423
Cincinnati.....	6.1	1,500	1,860	144.00	264	1,644.00	2,124	130	1,774.00	2,254
Cleveland.....	.8	1,800	2,420		525	1,800.00	2,945	86	1,886.00	3,031
Detroit.....	13.7		2,640		264	2,310.00	2,904	45	2,355.00	2,949
Los Angeles.....	4.5	2,040	2,400	240.00		2,280.00		157	2,437.00	
Milwaukee.....	11.3	1,800	2,100	180.00	180	1,980.00	2,340	117	2,097.00	2,457
Minneapolis.....	— 1.5	1,080	2,160		120	1,680.00	2,280	109	1,789.00	2,389
Newark.....	— 3.5					2,100.00	3,000	9	2,109.00	3,009
New Orleans.....	5.0	1,524	2,004	227.38		1,751.38		211	1,962.38	
Philadelphia.....	2.1	1,825	2,190	400.00	400	2,225.00	2,590	161	2,386.00	2,751
Pittsburgh.....	— 3.2		2,310		115	1,732.00	2,425	125	1,857.00	2,550
St. Louis.....	6.4		2,160			2,160.00	2,160	100	2,260.00	2,260
San Francisco.....	6.3		2,400		300	2,400.00	2,700	14	2,414.00	2,714
Kansas City.....	.8	1,500	1,680		180		1,860	264		2,124
Average.....									2,088.00	2,543
Average without Boston.....									2,120.00	2,572
Without Boston and St. Louis.....									2,109.00	2,598

<sup>1</sup> Living cost differential is the amount by which the basic minimum annual cost of living for an average manual worker's family, on a subsistence level, in the District of Columbia, as determined by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, exceeds the corresponding figure for the city in question.

On basis sugar ration, metropolitan areas. Washington population gain, 25 percent.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I submit the matter to the Senate on the presentation I have made.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION, ETC., OF DISABLED MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES AND THOSE DISABLED IN WAR INDUSTRIES—NOTICE

Mr. BURTON obtained the floor.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement for the information of Senators.

It had been my intention, after conferring with the majority leader, to move

that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 180 when the pending business had been disposed of. I am now informed that there is a second bill which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] desires to have taken up, and also that the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] has a measure which he wishes to bring before the Senate. After having conferred with the senior Senator from Kentucky and others I have decided to defer making a motion to proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 180 until Thursday next, at which time, as soon as I am able to secure recognition following the conclusion of the routine morning business, I shall make the motion which I had intended to make today.

INCREASE IN PAY OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 17) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk—

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STEWART in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield for that purpose?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.



The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Barbour	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Brewster	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murray	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. McFARLAND], and the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], and the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN] are necessarily absent.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is necessarily absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Eighty-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio to the committee amendment.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. In lieu of the amendment proposed by the committee, it is proposed to insert the following:

That Public Law No. 489 of the Seventy-first Congress (S. 1370), approved July 1, 1930, is hereby amended for and during the period in which this act shall be in effect by suspending sections 1, 2, and 3 thereof, and inserting in place thereof the following new sections:

"SECTION 1. That the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police shall be as follows: Major and superintendent, \$8,000; assistant superintendents, \$5,000 each; inspectors, \$4,500 each; captains, \$3,900 each; lieutenants, \$3,350 each; sergeants, \$3,050 each; privates, a basic salary of \$2,000 per year with an annual increase of \$140 in

salary for 5 years, or until a maximum salary of \$2,700 is reached. All original appointments of privates shall be made at the basic salary of \$2,000 per year, and the first year of service shall be probationary.

"SEC. 2. That the annual basic salaries of the officers and members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia shall be as follows: Chief engineer, \$8,000; deputy chief engineers, \$5,000 each; battalion chief engineers, \$4,500 each; fire marshal, \$5,000; deputy fire marshal, \$3,300; inspectors, \$2,760 each; captains, \$3,300 each; lieutenants, \$3,140 each; sergeants, \$2,900 each; superintendent of machinery, \$5,000; assistant superintendent of machinery, \$3,300; pilots, \$2,900 each; marine engineers, \$2,900 each; assistant marine engineers, \$2,760 each; marine firemen, \$2,400 each; privates, a basic salary of \$2,000 per year with an annual increase of \$140 in salary for 5 years or until a maximum salary of \$2,700 is reached. All original appointments of privates shall be made at the basic salary of \$2,000 per year, and the first year of service shall be probationary.

"SEC. 3. That privates of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, and the White House Police, and privates of the Fire Department shall be entitled to the following salaries: Privates who have served less than 1 year, at the rate of \$2,000 per annum; privates who have served more than 1 year and less than 2 years, at the rate of \$2,140 per annum; privates who have served more than 2 years and less than 3 years, at the rate of \$2,280 per annum; privates who have served more than 3 years and less than 4 years, at the rate of \$2,420 per annum; privates who have served more than 4 years and less than 5 years, at the rate of \$2,560 per annum; privates who have served more than 5 years, at the rate of \$2,700 per annum."

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and terminate June 30, 1944, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe, at which time sections 1, 2, and 3 of the act approved July 1, 1930, shall again become effective.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield in order that I may make an explanation?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TUNNELL in the chair). Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. In the President's veto of the firemen's and policemen's bill which was passed at the last session, he made special mention of the fact that we had not taken care of a great group of employees in the District, namely, the school teachers. The teachers are under different regulation from the firemen and policemen, so that it was necessary, and we deemed it proper, to introduce two bills instead of one. Therefore, Senate bill 17 deals with firemen and policemen, and Senate bill 18 deals with teachers. It is our desire to have the two bills go along together. Therefore, as soon as Senate bill 17 shall have been disposed of, I shall move the immediate consideration of Senate bill 18, so that the two bills may thus proceed through this body together.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, in proceeding to the consideration of the amendment in the nature of a substitute which I have presented I wish first of all to express my appreciation of the service which the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has been rendering to the Senate as chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

It has been my privilege to serve for 2 years on that committee, and I wish to pay tribute to the diligence, the intelligence, and the activity which he has displayed in leading that rather difficult committee, which deals with many matters which are considered only in committee, and which never reach the floor of the Senate.

My only reason for presenting minority views in this instance is that I feel that the action recommended by the majority is out of line with the policy of the Senate as a whole, and the rates of pay as a whole for the Nation as a whole, and I believe that in order that we may not leave the District behind, in order to treat the District fairly, and not put the District ahead of where it belongs, it is necessary for us to have in mind what is being done with respect to other Federal pay rolls, including other District pay rolls aside from those affecting policemen, firemen, and teachers.

The first obligation we have in the Senate is to make sure that the District of Columbia is not overlooked and left behind when we take measures affecting the rest of the United States. It became clear in the last session that it would be appropriate to increase somewhat the rates of pay of the employees of the Federal and District governments. We therefore passed in the last days of the session Senate Joint Resolution 170, which provided for overtime pay for employees both of the Federal Government and the District, with the exception of the District policemen, firemen, and teachers. That included, in cases where overtime pay could not be readily computed, payment on the basis of a 10-percent bonus. Of course, in the case of policemen, firemen, and teachers, overtime pay cannot be readily computed, and therefore an analogous raise would be a 10-percent bonus to bring them in line with the other employees of the Federal Government and to bring them in line with the other District employees.

It so happened, however, that there had been under study in the District committees of the House and the Senate a proposal to raise the pay of the policemen and firemen in the District of Columbia. I refer to the Metropolitan Police, numbering about 1,661 men; the metropolitan firemen, numbering about 902; the Park Police, numbering 78; and the White House Police, numbering about 126; a total of about 2,767 men, which is by no means a force in excess of what is needed in the District of Columbia.

The rates of pay have not been increased for a long time in the District. Therefore a study was made of that subject, and as a result of the study there was passed in the House a bill which provided on a well-considered basis an increase in the pay of policemen and firemen. The bill came before the District of Columbia Committee of the Senate. It was considered at length. It had the agreement of the members of the Police and Fire Departments, and the District Committee, and it was placed on the calendar with the recommendation that it pass, but it was not acted on in February or March, whenever it reached the calendar, because it was recognized that

at that time the Federal Government had not yet acted on pending bills for the increase of pay of employees of other branches of the District and Federal governments. Therefore the bill was held on the calendar until after action was taken in these other fields, and I believe it was appropriately held there. It was finally passed on the same day we passed the bill providing for the other employees and in the light of that bill having passed.

I wish to emphasize first of all that in taking that action we brought the District employees in line with the employees of the Federal Government, and brought the policemen and firemen in line with the other District employees.

The bill contained these provisions: It was to be a permanent increase in pay. It had been discussed on that basis; it had been agreed to on that basis by the representatives of the departments themselves who appeared before the committee. It was a permanent, justified basis of increase in pay, and well deserved. I will yield to no one in the recognition of the necessity for an able, diligent, and loyal police and fire department in a community of some 800,000 people, such as the city of Washington.

The increase provided was on this basis: Beginning with the full patrolman, a man who has had 5 years service, running through the captain, there was provided an increase of \$300 per year. That was the uniform basis. Then applying the increase also to the younger men below the 5-year patrolman, it made not so large an increase in their case, but I am convinced the reason for that was that their rate of pay already was above the rate of pay for similar service in many comparable cities in the United States. In any event it was agreed upon by representatives of the department as a permanent basis of pay.

The increase in their case was as follows: Instead of \$300 per man, the beginner was raised from \$1,900 a year to \$2,000 a year. The second year man was raised from \$2,000 a year to \$2,140 a year, that is an increase of \$140 in his case. The third year man was raised from \$2,100 a year to \$2,280. The fourth year man was raised from \$2,200 a year to \$2,420. The fifth year man was raised from \$2,300 a year to \$2,560 a year. And finally the \$2,400-a-year man was raised to \$2,700, making a \$300 increase.

I emphasize that such an increase was probably long over-due. It was necessary. It should have been voted. It was voted by the Senate and by the House in December of last year.

But when the measure reached the President it was vetoed, not because of the increase being too large or too small, but because it was on a permanent basis, whereas the increase to the other Federal employees and District employees was on temporary basis to April 30, 1943; secondly, on the ground that it did not include the teachers, for the teachers had not been put in that bill, and their bill had not come up for action; and, thirdly, on the ground that instead of being retroactive to December 1942, as in the case of the other employees of the Federal

Government and the District, it was retroactive to February 1, 1942, because it was an old bill that had been on the calendar for a long time, and had started with that date. It was vetoed on those grounds in a message in which the President suggested that a comparable bill, with those exceptions, would meet with approval.

What I am seeking to do at this time is to move a substitute which will reenact precisely the rate of pay which was agreed upon by the members of the District Committee as a permanent rate of pay, passed in December last on that basis, and now, only 2½ months later, I believe still to be recognized by us as an appropriate rate of pay at this time.

In order that there may be no delay in the men getting their increased pay and getting it from December 1, 1942, it is obvious that we should pass a measure similar to the one which previously passed both Houses of Congress, and was vetoed for certain reasons, and that we should omit the provisions on which the veto was based. If passed in that form, I believe there will be no objection to it in the House, which passed the other bill. It would take effect immediately. It would be generally in line with all other increases of pay in the Federal Government and, in general, would represent an increase of about 10 percent in the cost of the District departments. The cost of these departments to the District is about \$6,000,000. The proposed increase in pay would make the cost \$6,600,000. Mr. President, it will be remembered that the increase Congress voted Federal employees was 10 percent on the first \$2,900. An increase of \$290 was provided for many employees drawing more than \$2,900. The increase proposed by the amendment being a flat \$300 in most cases, and being somewhat less in the lower brackets, is generally in line with that program, and therefore I believe is a fair step to take, particularly in view of the long hearings and the full discussion of the subject with members of the departments.

Therefore, I think it is important, if we are not to leave the District behind, that we pass the bill which will most quickly go through both Houses and bring the employees in question into line with the other employees and let them get their increase as of December 1, 1942.

We made a special examination into these matters to make sure that it is a fair and just measure for the District in line with the proper principles of municipal government at this time. I wish to say first that we have this base to stand on: The measure of increase was approved in the hearings as a permanent basis of pay. Therefore it certainly would be as good now as a basis of pay as it was when a similar bill was passed two and a half months ago.

Next, the increase is substantially the same as was allowed other Federal employees and other employees of the District.

Third, it is generally in line with the pay for comparable work in comparable cities.

Mr. President, I recognize that it is not fair and proper to bind any one city by

the example of another. Even the statistics are not comparable in detail. To a certain extent they must be adjusted to meet the cost of living, and I have done that. But I believe that in general I can recognize that the proposed rates, as agreed upon by the departments, and as contained in the bill passed by us last December, are in line with the comparable rates of pay for similar departments elsewhere.

Let us begin with the regular rate of pay for the patrolman—that is the man who will be getting \$2,700 under the proposed rate of pay—and let us compare that pay with the pay in the 11 large comparable cities of New York, Chicago, Philadelphia, Detroit, Los Angeles, Cleveland, San Francisco, Pittsburgh, Boston, Baltimore, and Cincinnati. Those are cities which are comparable roughly with Washington in the matter of cost of living. The cost of living in those cities does not vary more than 10 percent from that in Washington. The cost of living in most of them is closer to that of Washington than 10 percent.

If the rate of pay in the District of Columbia for the regular patrolman is fixed at \$2,700, there are only five cities in that group where the rate of pay is higher, and there are six where the rate is lower. Washington will be approximately in the average place among cities of similar size. The cities in which the pay is above that in Washington are New York with \$3,000; Chicago, \$2,802; Detroit, \$2,904; Cleveland with a shifting figure of \$2,675 to \$2,945 in the discretion of the safety department; and San Francisco with \$2,700.

Those in which the pay is below that in Washington are Philadelphia with \$2,590, Los Angeles with \$2,580, Pittsburgh with \$2,425, Boston with \$2,200, Baltimore with \$2,080 for the police department and \$2,000 for the fire department, and Cincinnati with \$2,124.

Those figures are taken from communications sent to me by the mayors of those cities within the past month.

Turning to the comparable pay of the beginner, as to which a special provision is made in the bill presented by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], there again we find that the increase from the old pay of \$1,900 to the new pay of \$2,000 is squarely in line with the average of the comparable cities of the United States. The reason why a larger increase would not be called for is that the pay already is higher than in many comparable cities. In the same comparable cities to which I have referred only five pay more than \$2,000 and six pay less than \$2,000. The five paying more than \$2,000 are Chicago with \$2,400, Philadelphia with \$2,225, Detroit with \$2,310, Los Angeles with \$2,280, and San Francisco with \$2,400.

Those paying less than \$2,000 to beginners are New York, with \$1,660; Cleveland, with \$1,800; Pittsburgh, with \$1,732; Boston, with \$1,700; Baltimore, with \$1,820 for the policemen and \$1,700 for the firemen; and Cincinnati, with \$1,320.

Again Washington, on this adjusted basis, is within the average of the comparable cities.



I may say a word also in answer to the argument as to the cost of living. According to the Department of Labor, the cost of living in these 11 cities does not in any case vary more than 10 percent from that in Washington. The lowest figure for cost of living in any of these cities is 90.4 compared with 100 in Washington.

The cities which are paying less to their beginner firemen than the city of Washington under this new plan are New York, with \$1,600 as against \$2,000. Cost of living is almost exactly the same, because it stands at 99.5 in New York compared to 100 in Washington.

In Cleveland, with \$1,800 as the starting figure, the cost of living stands at 95 compared with Washington at 100.

Pittsburgh, with \$1,732, 92.8 percent.

Boston, with \$1,700, 95.7 percent.

Baltimore, with \$1,700 for firemen and \$1,820 for policemen, 90.4 percent.

Cincinnati, with \$1,320 as a starting point, 91.7 percent.

If each of those amounts were adjusted upward by the necessary 5 or 10 percent increase to meet the cost of living, it would still come under the \$2,000 figure provided in the substitute amendment for the beginner.

In dealing with the morale of the city administration and the city police department, I believe that those in the best position to judge what the pay should be and what effect it would have on the morale are those in charge of the executive branch of the Government. I have before me a letter which was sent to the able Senator from Nevada, as chairman of the Senate District of Columbia Committee, under date of February 6, 1943, signed by the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia. The Board of Commissioners disagreed with the Senator from Nevada and in the following words expressly approved the recommendation which I am now making. The last sentence of the letter reads as follows:

The Commissioners recommend, therefore, that the substitute bill proposed by Senator BURTON be adopted.

That is a definite recommendation by the men responsible for the morale of the employees of both the Police Department and the Fire Department. I am not contending that the rate of pay should not be further studied if later a further increase should be granted to other Federal employees and other employees of the District of Columbia. However, I believe that under the present circumstances the rate of pay proposed by the amendment is justified by the pay for comparable positions and by the action we have already taken with regard to other District employees. If we do not adopt the program which I have proposed, we shall discriminate against other employees of the District of Columbia, who are receiving a 10-percent bonus instead of an increase of \$350, as provided in the proposal of the senior Senator from Nevada.

I wish also to emphasize the fact that we are now in the midst of considering general changes in rates of pay for employees of the Federal Government and employees of the District. We are also considering means of economizing in

handling the finances of the Federal Government as well as those of the District.

The increase proposed by the majority proposal is not merely an increase of \$300 or \$350. The cost to the District of Columbia would be increased by one-half. Instead of being increased from \$6,000,000 to \$6,600,000, the cost would be increased from \$6,000,000 to \$6,900,000. The increase is such, and the field it covers is such, that it would add 50 percent to the cost of the services.

I do not believe that we should override the recommendations of those in charge of the administration of the District of Columbia, and, over their objection, increase by 50 percent the cost of administration of the District Government for which they are primarily responsible as executive officers of the District.

The factor which really moves me most in bringing this subject to the attention of the Senate is the relation between the pay situation in the District of Columbia and the general pay situation in the Federal Government. It so happens that I have been serving on the Committee on Civil Service. We have been considering a number of bills. We now have before us a bill dealing with rates of pay of Federal employees and employees of the District of Columbia after April 30, 1943. It therefore seems to me that we should await action upon a bill of broad scope before going ahead with one for the District of Columbia on a different basis from anything Congress has adopted in the past.

I wish to emphasize that the bill before us, to which I am objecting, introduces a novel basis for increasing the pay of Federal employees. Instead of being on a 10 percent basis, or on the basis of a \$300 flat increase, as proposed in the Postal Service bill—which is not quite comparable—it is on the basis of a \$350 flat increase to every employee. That basis is carried over into the teachers' bill, which will follow the bill now before us.

If we are to adopt the basis of a flat increase of \$350 for teachers in the District of Columbia and \$350 for the Metropolitan Police force, the White House Police, and the Park Police, we shall have difficulty in avoiding the discrimination which will result if we do not do the same thing for other District of Columbia employees, and for that matter, all Federal employees. No greater harm can be done in any kind of governmental practice than to discriminate between employees in comparable positions. Low pay is not so bad as discrimination. Discrimination disorganizes efficient operation of any government. Therefore, I believe we should bring about an increase as promptly as possible, consistent with what we did last December, dealing uniformly with both Federal and District pay rolls. After the general policy has been adopted, if necessary we can reconsider this increase in the light of other adjustments. Let us not place rates of pay for policemen and firemen on a different basis from rates of pay for Federal employees or for other employees of the District of Columbia. I believe it to be in the interest of orderly government to proceed on that basis. Therefore I agree

with the District Commissioners that we should pass the substitute measure which I have offered which would keep increases in pay in the District government in line with other increases, rather than put them on an independent basis.

Mr. BYRD. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I understand that the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are opposed to the so-called McCarran bill and are in favor of the substitute measure offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. BURTON. I will put into the Record the letter of February 6, 1943, which discusses both bills and concludes with the following sentence:

The Commissioners recommend, therefore, that the substitute bill proposed by Senator BURTON be adopted.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator vouch for the letter having been dictated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia?

Mr. BURTON. I do not know by whom the letter was dictated.

Mr. BYRD. By whom was it signed?

Mr. BURTON. The letter was handed to me by the corporation counsel of the District of Columbia as a copy of a letter bearing the signature of the President of the Board of Commissioners. My copy does not have the signature on it, but it was handed to me by the corporation counsel as being a copy of the original letter, which I assumed was signed.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator from Ohio have any information indicating that the copy was not authentic?

Mr. BURTON. No; and I ask the Senator from Nevada if there is any doubt about the authenticity of the letter.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator has had previous experience along this line, I noticed that he smiled when I propounded the question.

Mr. BYRD. If there is any charge that the copy of the letter to which reference has been made by the able Senator from Ohio is not authentic, it seems to me that the charge should be proved or withdrawn.

Mr. BURTON. I will be glad to withdraw the copy if there is any question about it. I have only the word of the corporation counsel that it is an authentic copy.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not disputing the authenticity of the copy. I have the same letter. I also have the statement which I read a little while before the Senator took the floor, which was made by the same member of the Board of District Commissioners who purportedly signed the letter from which the Senator read to the Senate, a copy of which I have. We have been through this same thing before. We know that certain letters were sent to us which purported to be signed by the President of the Board of Commissioners, but which were not dictated by the President of the Board. I believe the Senator from Ohio will not dispute that statement.

Mr. BURTON. I have no knowledge as to who dictated it. I understand that

the letter is authentic. It is signed in the name of, and presumably by, the President of the Board of Commissioners. I assume there is no question about it being an official statement of the President of the Board of Commissioners.

Mr. BYRD. As the Senator knows, many letters are sent, even by the President of the United States, which are not dictated by the President. However, there is no question that the letter referred to by the Senator from Ohio represents the attitude of the District Commissioners, is there?

Mr. BURTON. I believe there is no question about it; and I think the Senator from Nevada recognizes it as the last official statement from the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYRD. I wish to propound another question to the Senator from Ohio. What percentage of increase would be represented by the proposed increase of \$350?

Mr. BURTON. Of course, that would vary. As the Senator from Nevada has pointed out, in the case of the man with a lower rate of pay, it would be more than 17 percent. In the case of a \$4,500 man it would be less than 10 percent. The net result would be about 15 percent on the median rate of pay. It can be tested most simply by pointing out that under my proposal the cost would be increased by \$600,000, while under the majority proposal the cost would be increased by \$900,000, or 50 percent, representing an average increase of from 10 to 15 percent.

Mr. BYRD. Do I correctly understand from the Senator from Ohio that the proposed increase of \$350 would represent discrepancies and discrimination between employees of the same branch of the service?

Mr. BURTON. The same increase would be granted to each employee, but the percentages would vary. District employees who are not in the police or fire department, and not in the teaching force, would still receive the 10-percent bonus.

Mr. BYRD. There would be further discrimination between District employees and civil service employees of the Federal Government, for whom legislation has already been enacted.

Mr. BURTON. That is correct. Let me add that if there is to be a readjustment of pay on a higher basis than the 10-percent bonus, it will be from April 30, 1943, on, whereas the bill would make the increase effective, even on the highest rate, retroactively from December 1, 1942, for these employees, and these employees alone.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator not agree with me that an increase in pay of District employees in greater proportion than the increase in the pay of civil-service employees would create a discrimination between District employees and Federal employees, which would operate as an influence on Congress to increase the pay of Federal employees to the same extent that the pay of District employees is increased?

Mr. BURTON. Let me say, as the Senator from Nevada has said, that an argument can always be made that the cost of living in the District of Columbia is a little higher than it is elsewhere; but it is so little higher that I do not believe it justifies any such discrepancy as would exist under the committee bill. As compared with the cost of living in most comparable cities, the cost of living in the District of Columbia is less than 10 percent higher. Therefore, that situation would justify at the most an increase of 10 percent in the 10-percent bonus, or an additional 1 percent. There is no justification for a 50-percent increase in cost to the District of Columbia, such as would be brought about by the committee bill.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that in making such a distinction we should have to make a difference between the pay to civil-service employees in Washington and that to civil-service employees serving elsewhere in the country, which would be an impossible thing to do.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. In specific answer to the Senator from Virginia, let me say that the greatest increase under the bill would be 19.4 percent. The increase under House bill 6386, which passed in December, was 26 percent. So if we talk about discrepancies we must take that matter into consideration.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I should state at this point, for the Senator from Nevada, that when the increase is more than 10 percent it is because there is an increase in the time worked. The increase is one of overtime pay in recognition of the time worked, rather than a flat bonus for the same time worked.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator state the hours of work of a policeman or fireman?

Mr. BURTON. A policeman or fireman works full time, 24 hours a day. I respect him for it, and he is paid on that basis.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	Overton
Austin	Gillette	Radcliffe
Bailey	Green	Reed
Ball	Guffey	Revercomb
Bankhead	Gurney	Reynolds
Barbour	Hatch	Russell
Barkley	Hawkes	Scrugham
Bone	Hayden	Shipstead
Brewster	Hill	Smith
Brooks	Holman	Stewart
Buck	Johnson, Calif.	Taft
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McCarran	Tydings
Chavez	McKellar	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	Maloney	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	Maybank	Wagner
Connally	Mead	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Moore	Wheeler
Eastland	Murray	Wherry
Ellender	Nye	White
Ferguson	O'Daniel	Wiley
George	O'Mahoney	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MAYBANK in the chair). Eighty-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, much ado has been made about the attitude of the District Commissioners. Who knows best the police force of the District of Columbia? Who is best qualified to speak for the District of Columbia so far as its police force is concerned? The District Commissioners have opposed every increase of salary that has been offered. Are they the best qualified? The able Senator from Ohio makes much of a letter he has received, and which he has offered for the Record, in which the District Commissioners favor his substitute; but his substitute is almost identical to the bill which Congress passed last December. The District Commissioners opposed it then with all the power they had; they were opposed to the Senator's bill in December last; but they are in favor of it now, notwithstanding the fact that the cost of living in the District of Columbia has gone up since December last as reported by the Labor Department. They were opposed to a \$300 increase in December; they were opposed to a \$300 increase throughout the year 1942; but they are in favor of it now in place of a \$350 increase which is only slightly in keeping, if you please, with the increased cost of living in the District of Columbia. But who knows the Police Department of the District of Columbia best—the Commissioners or the Chief of Police? Let us see what the Chief of Police says about this. He is not in the category that would be affected; he would not be touched by this bill at all; he is entirely removed from it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. Am I correct in understanding the Senator to say that the proposed substitute is practically the same as House bill 6386 which was vetoed by the President?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Ohio in his proposal does not provide retroactive payment to February 1, 1942, as did the bill passed at the last session; he does not provide that the increase shall be permanent as did the bill which was vetoed.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. So the proposed substitute of the Senator from Ohio is not the same as the legislation the Commissioners opposed when a similar bill was under consideration at the last session.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Commissioners opposed it in the early part of 1942, when the retroactive feature would have been operative only for 30 or 60 days. The retroactive feature, of course, became augmented when the bill passed the Senate because such a long delay had been permitted to ensue; but the District Commissioners were opposed to it when it was first initiated, and they will be opposed to every proposal for an increase in the compensation of men who toil which may be presented, but they will



not oppose a raise in their own set-up, and mark my words as to that. They will oppose those in the police department who pound the sidewalks and those in the fire department who respond to alarms, but they will not oppose anything that augments their own power. Power is a funny thing, and it is just as funny in the District of Columbia as it is elsewhere. Let us see what the Chief of Police of the District says. I read from the record.

Major KELLY, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the men of the police department get an increase commensurate with the scale of living—

"An increase commensurate with the scale of living." What is that? It is 114.9 as compared with other cities. That is the scale of living in the District of Columbia.

We know that the cost of living has gone up, and I would like to see the men in our department who are performing hazardous duties at all times get a sufficient raise so that their families would be able to enjoy, as comparably as they possibly can, an increase of salary to meet conditions due to the national emergency.

I would say that since the national emergency started policemen have been called upon to render many extra duties. In the beginning we were required to cancel leaves, days off, due to the many details we were required to perform. As time went on, we restored the day off, and we restored the leave as best we could, granting 3 days' leave to about 4 or 5 percent of each precinct. We have increased that a little now. We have gone up now to 5 or 6 days, probably a little more, in each precinct and each unit to 10 percent of the command. The Manual requires us to grant leave to no more than 10 percent of the command at any one time.

The men have put in many extra hours of work. In many cases we have tried to restore the hours that they have lost, but there has been such an accumulation of extra work that up to this time we have not been able to give it all back to the men.

I would like to say on behalf of the members of the police department that have performed fine police work during the past year.

Who has performed that work? I draw the attention of the Senator from Virginia because he has given so much attention to this matter that I think it is well for him to dwell upon it. Who has performed so much extra work? The police force of the District of Columbia in which the Senator from Virginia is so much interested.

Let me say here, to digress for a moment, that there is a very highly critical tone in the views of the minority. I do not think there is anyone more interested in the District of Columbia than is the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, what was it the Senator said about a "highly critical tone"?

Mr. McCARRAN. I said there is a highly critical tone in the views of the minority on the bill. That does not apply to the Senator from Virginia of course, and if he will wait a moment—

Mr. BYRD. I thought the Senator from Nevada referred to "the Senator from Virginia."

Mr. McCARRAN. If the Senator from Virginia will give me his attention, he will not then be mistaken.

Mr. BYRD. I was trying to give the Senator my attention, but I was diverted for a moment and probably missed that part of his remarks.

Mr. McCARRAN. I always try to give the Senator from Virginia my attention. Perhaps there are other more interesting matters at this time, but the statement in the views of the minority to which I refer is that which criticizes the chairman of the Committee on the District of Columbia because the committee reported to the Senate a bill when, the minority views say, there was not a quorum of the committee present at the time. Mr. President, if the Committee on the District of Columbia should wait for a quorum, it would wait a long time.

Mr. President, I have had in my possession for many months—indeed, ever since I have been chairman of the committee—the proxy of the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS]. I think it is a great honor for me to hold it, and never once has he questioned it. The senior Senator from Virginia has always been willing to go along with my judgment on these matters, and I am surprised that the junior Senator from Virginia does not go along with the senior Senator from Virginia in this all-important matter.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Virginia usually makes up his own mind and votes his own convictions; and while he has great regard for the senior Senator from Virginia, the senior Senator from Virginia has not been here. So, why should I follow the senior Senator from Virginia when he has been unable to attend the hearings of the District of Columbia Committee?

I wish to say further that I have great admiration and respect for the distinguished chairman of the committee, and I am entirely willing to vote to give to the policemen of the District of Columbia, as I said before, a reasonable increase in salary, and I think that the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio gives a reasonable and proper increase to the policemen of the District of Columbia, and I speak as one who is very deeply interested in the District of Columbia. I want to see justice done to the policemen of the District, and I think the substitute offered by the Senator from Ohio will do justice to them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Does the Senator think that his constituents would be overpaid if they received \$4.16 more a month than they would get under the substitute?

Mr. BYRD. I think that the proposal made by the Senator from Ohio to give a \$300 increase on the average, as I understand it, would provide an adequate increase and would be in proportion to what has been done in the case of employees of the Federal Government. For that reason I intend to support the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. McCARRAN. Then \$4.16 to men who receive less than a living wage in the District of Columbia, some of whom—

Mr. BYRD. I do not admit that they receive less than a living wage.

Mr. McCARRAN. Just a moment. I have the floor, and I refuse to yield to that kind of argument.

Mr. BYRD. I do not admit the Senator's premise—

Mr. McCARRAN. The figures constitute the premise.

Mr. BYRD. I do not admit that the premise of the Senator from Nevada that they are not receiving a living wage and that the proposal of the Senator from Ohio would give them less than a living wage is correct.

Mr. McCARRAN. The substitute of the Senator from Ohio would give those in the lower brackets \$4.16 a month less than the bill reported by the committee. If the Senator wants to take from his constituents \$4.16 a month—another bottle of milk, perhaps, or another pair of shoes for the policemen—then, I have no further argument to make to the able Senator from Virginia.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Virginia would take nothing from the salaries of the police; it is a question of increasing their salaries, as the Senator from Nevada well knows, and when he say I want to take from any of my constituents who may be on the police force \$4.16 a month, which has not been given to them, he is making a statement that is not borne out by the facts.

Mr. McCARRAN. It is borne out by the figures, and figures do not lie.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator contend that the policemen have this increase now?

Mr. McCARRAN. I beg the Senator's pardon.

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator contend that the policemen have the increase now?

Mr. McCARRAN. No.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Nevada said the Senator from Virginia was taking it away from them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly the Senator will attempt to, if he votes for the substitute.

Mr. BYRD. Take away something they do not have?

Mr. McCARRAN. No; take away from them something they should have.

Mr. BYRD. There is a disagreement with the Senator about that, and I think the Senator should be reasonable enough to know that we can differ about these matters. The Senator has a fine mind, and I respect it. He is an able, brilliant Senator, but I have at least some mental capacity, and I try to operate my mind as best I can.

Mr. McCARRAN. That does not answer the argument at all. That is just a plaudit, which does not answer anything.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator is assuming that his judgment is infallible and always correct—

Mr. McCARRAN. Not at all.

Mr. BYRD. I say that there are others in the Senate who have some judgment, and all we can do in these matters is to vote in accordance with the dictates of our conscience.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. I am willing to vote as I have suggested, and I am doing it with the knowledge, which the Senator must have, that I am deeply interested in the maintenance of law and order in the District of Columbia. I am voting as indicated because I think the provision pro-

posed is fair and just. The Senator may disagree with me, but when he talks about my taking away \$4.16 from the policemen, which he says is a bottle of milk a day, then he is stating something that is not correct, because they have not gotten the \$4.16.

Mr. McCARRAN. With the same degree of cogency the Senator could say they have not the \$300, either.

Mr. BYRD. Why should I not vote, by the same reasoning, to make the figure \$400 or \$500?

Mr. McCARRAN. Vote to give them a bottle of milk.

Mr. BYRD. Not only a bottle of milk but a bottle of something else, too, perhaps. With all due respect to the Senator from Nevada, who usually makes a clear and logical argument, I do not think in this instance he is doing so.

Mr. McCARRAN. The trouble is that the Senator from Virginia, in making his argument here, in propounding a question to the Senator from Ohio, seems to be wedded to the substitute bill because there is a differential of \$50.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say I was wedded to it.

Mr. McCARRAN. I say there is a differential of \$4.16 a month.

Mr. BYRD. I do not think the Senator from Nevada should put words in my mouth. I never said I was wedded to it for that reason. I merely asked a question.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator said so himself.

Mr. BYRD. I did not say I was wedded to it. I said I approved the proposal of the Senator from Ohio, and I approved that particular provision. That is not the only reason why I shall vote for the proposal of the Senator from Ohio. I think all of us are entitled to our judgment, that we are all entitled to vote as we see fit to vote. I may make many errors—as I do—but at least I can say I vote in accordance with my sincere judgment.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am sorry to see the Senator from Virginia, whom I have followed very closely in his effort to effect economies, and whom I hope to continue to support very closely, go into a line which does not reflect economy at all. In other words, I dislike to see him led astray by something based on a false premise.

Mr. BYRD. I appreciate very much the kindness of the Senator in acting as my guardian. I shall be very careful to observe and give full consideration to all the suggestions he may make.

Mr. McCARRAN. I thank the Senator. I continue now with the statement of Major Kelly:

I would like to say on behalf of the members of the police department that they have performed fine police work during the past year. They have been very faithful, very loyal, and their devotion to duty is commendable.

The CHAIRMAN. What has been your turn-over, Major?

Major KELLY. We have appointed approximately, in the past year, about 560 men.

Mr. President, I wish to draw the attention of the Senate to that. He says:

We have appointed approximately, in the past year, about 560 men.

Why was there such a turn-over when, under the classified civil service, these men were assured of a tenure in office? Why was there a turn-over? It was simply because \$1,900 would not sustain the average family in the District of Columbia, and therefore it was not alluring to men to enter the service and serve for a year, or perhaps longer, at \$1,900 a year. Secondly, it was because a position paying \$1,900 a year, while it might have been worth while a year ago, is not worth while now. There are 77 vacancies in the police department of the District of Columbia at this time because it is not possible to fill the places. Yet the Chief of Police is asking for more men because of the District's increase in population, extending into the hundreds of thousands.

I read further from the testimony:

The CHAIRMAN. You have lost that number and more?

Major KELLY. We have not lost exactly that many, but Congress last year was generous enough to give to the police department 195 additional men, which made that many vacancies. Then we have been required also to fill vacancies that occurred at the White House. The bill passed also allowed them 60 additional men. Then, with the many enlistments, with some men inducted into the service, many men belonging to the Officers' Reserve, and men enlisting voluntarily, and separations for various reasons caused the remainder of the vacancies.

The CHAIRMAN. In your judgment, and from your observation, Major, did the high salaries paid in other lines of work draw from your force to any great extent?

Major KELLY. We have had some few men who have resigned from the service due to the fact that they have obtained better positions. We feel also that many other men would leave the service if it were not for the security of the positions.

The CHAIRMAN. The Budget for the coming year does not promise you any considerable amount for increases. In other words, you asked for 200 and the Budget contemplates about 100?

Major KELLY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. And that struck me—and I hope you will correct me if I am wrong—when I saw that item, it struck me that with the increased population of the District of Columbia, and the increased duties that have devolved upon and will devolve upon the police force, when in your judgment the 200 was absolutely essential that the 100 will not meet the essential phases, hence you are going to impress on the police force for the next year at least just as we have in the past, a greater number of overtime hours, a greater vigilance and a greater service in every respect. Am I correct in that assumption?

Major KELLY. In asking for 200 men, to be honest and candid about it, that is not a drop in the bucket. With the increased population, with the many new streets throughout the District of Columbia, the many new houses that have gone up, apartments all throughout the city—and some of the settlements are practically cities in themselves. I was talking one time with Mayor LaGuardia, in comparing our police department with theirs. They have between 18,000 and 19,000 policemen for a population of 7,000,000 people. I am convinced that our population, the people living in the District of Columbia, together with people who come into the District of Columbia from nearby Maryland and Virginia for their employment, runs us over a million people. Mayor LaGuardia said at that time, considering our growing population and a comparison with his police department, that it

looked like we should have about 3,000 policemen.

I dwell on that for a moment, because it is imposing on some 1,600 policemen now in the District of Columbia duties which should be performed by 3,000 policemen. That grows out of the fact that the Capital of the Nation is a place of attraction. Thousands of people are coming into the District daily. Not only that but hundreds of thousands who were not employed here before are now being employed here. People who have come from every section of the country, people who have come from every section of the world, are being employed here, and there is not a city in all the extent of this country that is better governed, from the standpoint of the police regulations and the police records, than is the District of Columbia at the present time. I say governed from the police standpoint, mind you. I limit my expression to that.

Mr. President, some misleading statements have been made here by my able colleague the Senator from Ohio, and I wish to dwell on them, and I think what I have before me, prepared on the basis of the figures, is sufficient to sustain what I am contending.

In several of its passages the minority views seem likely to mislead a casual reader. They have evidently misled one Member of the Senate. For instance, the first paragraph on page 4 of the minority views gives the impression, intentionally or otherwise, that the committee bill will boost the increase or proposed raise \$290,000 above the raise proposed by the minority proposal, through granting increases to high-salaried employees. That is not the fact.

In the case of policemen, the five grades of privates now receiving under \$2,400 per year would get \$260,050 of the total raises proposed by the committee bill. The minority substitute would give these same men raises totaling only \$104,540. Thus \$155,510 of the total by which the cost of the committee bill exceeds that of the minority substitute would go to these privates in the Metropolitan Police force, the men who most deserve and need increases.

Let me dwell on that point for a moment. One thousand nine hundred dollars is the pay for police service during the first year of service. There is great attraction to those in that service to go abroad and work for higher salaries, for the cost of living in the District of Columbia is going up by leaps and bounds. It was testified by the writer of the letter which was read earlier today at the desk that \$1,900 is no salary at all. What would the substitute bill give to the newly appointed policeman? It would give him an increase of \$100 a year. He might just as well receive no increase. He may go out and get a job paying him \$14 a day, or \$100 a week, or \$500 a month, a job which he knows he can get on the outside in war activity. However, due to his loyalty, due to his desire to serve, due to an adherence to service, due to the fact that if he remains constant in his present position he will have something in the future, the man remains on the job at a salary of \$1,900 a year, and he would remain



on the job at \$1,900 a year, plus \$100 increase if the substitute bill were enacted. It seems to me those things should be considered by us.

What will we do with 360 men who now receive only \$1,900 a year, and who would receive an increase in salary of only \$100 under the substitute measure? What will we do with 337 men who under the substitute will receive only an approximate 14 percent raise in salary, whereas the rise in the cost of living is 19.5 percent? It seems to me it is a question of being practical rather than of being theoretical.

Mr. President, there are those who are opposed to any increase in salaries at this time. Perhaps that is proper. There are those who are so economically minded that they can see nothing but cutting down salaries and wages. But the economy of the country does not run that way. The economy of the country is increasing the cost of living to the average citizen. If we cut down the salaries of those in the public service we will force public servants out of office. They will not serve us any longer. They will go where they can receive better pay, and they can always come back to their old jobs in time of stress. It seems to me it would be much better to take a practical view of this whole situation than to take of it a theoretical, economic view.

Mr. President, under the committee bill or the proposed substitute, who will get the extra money represented by the increased pay?

In the case of policemen, the five grades of privates now receiving under \$2,400 per year would get \$260,000 of the total raises proposed by the committee bill. The minority substitute would give these same men raises totaling only \$104,540. Thus \$155,510 of the total by which the cost of the committee bill exceeds that of the minority substitute would go to these privates in the Metropolitan Police force, the men who most deserve and need increases. Raises proposed by the committee bill for police officials now receiving over \$3,600 per year would total only \$2,100.

In the case of firemen, 295 men now receiving less than \$2,400 per year would get \$103,250 of the total raises proposed by the committee bill. The minority substitute would give these same men raises totaling \$39,340. Thus \$63,910 of the difference in cost between the committee bill and the proposed minority substitute would go to these men who need the raises most. Raises proposed by the committee bill for officials of the fire department now receiving more than \$3,000 would total only \$5,250.

Mr. President, something was said by the able Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] bearing on the subject of the increased cost of living. Let me say that the increased cost of living in some of the cities mentioned by him must be considered from the standpoint of an increase that was in existence when the tabulations used by the Senator were formulated, and long before. Let us take, for instance, Philadelphia. The subsistence level in Philadelphia for a family of four is \$1,570. In Detroit it is \$1,686. In Los Angeles it is \$1,574. In Cleveland it is \$1,645. In Baltimore it is \$1,566. In St. Louis it is \$1,670. In Boston it is \$1,657. In Pittsburgh it is \$1,606. Whereas in

Washington it is \$1,731—the highest of all.

Following the cities I have mentioned come San Francisco, and others, including Kansas City.

Mr. President, laying aside all technicalities, does anyone deny, and will the able Senator from Ohio deny that the cost of living has increased in the District of Columbia far out of line compared with the cost of living in any other city in the country? Will anyone deny that the cost of living in the District of Columbia is higher than in any other comparable city of the country? If it be true that the cost of living in the District of Columbia is higher than in any other comparable city of the country, let us not forget the public servants who serve not in hours, but in days and years, who have no limit of time of service, but are subject to call at all times, and let us say to them, "You shall have at least an increase of compensation commensurate with the cost of living as it has gone up in the District of Columbia." If we do that we will not give an increase of \$100 to the \$1,900-a-year men, and approximately \$150 a year increase to the \$2,400-a-year men. We will give the higher range of increase to the one who needs it, to the one who has, for example, two children and a wife, and who has been obliged to move out of the District of Columbia in order to live at all, and who denies himself everything, and who can provide his children only a minimum of amusement. We will give a raise to such an employee commensurate with the raises given in the higher brackets. We will give such an employee a raise of \$350 a year.

Mr. President, let me now speak of the danger of a veto in this case. Let us study the veto message of the President with respect to the bill passed last year. The President dwelt specifically upon the fact that we had not taken in the teachers of the District of Columbia, and then he dwelt upon the fact that we allowed the bill to rest so long in the Senate that it was retroactive to the extent of 1 year. When we put the bill through the Senate in December we were standing between the devil and the deep blue sea. In other words, if we sent it back to the House, at that time there was not a quorum of the membership of the House in the city, so that one objection would kill the bill. If we passed it and sent it to the President, he might veto it. We took a chance with the latter course, and got "left." We would have been "left" in either event. Now we have before us a bill which has been worked out based on the facts in the case, and we ask that the substitute bill be not adopted.

#### STRIKES IN WAR INDUSTRIES

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I introduce a bill entitled "Relating to strikes in war industries during the war, and for other purposes" and ask unanimous consent that the bill be read at the desk for the information of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read.

The bill (S. 802) relating to strikes in war industries during the war, and for

other purposes, was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Whereas it is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to marshal and utilize the full manpower of the country in the present emergency, in all war industries as well as in the combat services; and

Whereas the critical need of the armed services for supplies, munitions, and shipping makes it imperative that no stoppages of work in war industries be tolerated for any cause, or for any length of time. Strikes, slow-downs, and voluntary absences from work are definite aids to the enemy; and

Whereas recalcitrant employers have been effectively dealt with by seizure of their plants under authority of war powers legislation; and

Whereas the adjustment of wages has been taken out of the control of management by order of the Administrator of Economic Stabilization; and

Whereas management, having been deprived by governmental edict of jurisdiction to bargain collectively under the National Labor Relations Act with reference to adjustment of wages, is powerless to adjust those differences that cause industrial strife.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5 of the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940, as amended, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(m) Until the cessation of hostilities in the present war every registrant under this act (1) who is employed by any person engaged under contract or otherwise in the manufacture, production, or mining of any articles or materials for the United States or any agency thereof, or of any articles or materials required by the United States or any agency thereof for use in connection with the war effort, and (2) who strikes or acts in concert with other employees in such manner that their absence from work will seriously impede or delay the manufacture, production, or mining of such articles or materials, shall immediately notify his selective service local board to that effect, and the employers affected shall make public the names and addresses of the employees concerned. Thereupon, such local board shall proceed immediately to determine, subject to appeal in accordance with section 10 (a) (2) whether it will be in the best interests of the war effort for such registrant to be inducted into the land or naval forces under this act, to continue to be employed in the work in which he was engaged immediately prior to his notification to the local board as herein provided, or to be employed in some other work essential to the war effort. The local board shall notify the registrant of its determination and shall attach to such notification an appropriate order directing the registrant to report for induction into the land or naval forces or to return to work. Each such registrant who fails to notify his local board as herein provided, or who fails to comply with any such order issued by his local board, shall be subject to the same penalties that are applicable in the case of failure to comply with any other requirement of this act."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the bill introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] will be received and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, the bill just introduced is for the purpose of preventing strikes, or "employees acting in concert with each other in such manner as their absence from work will seriously impede or delay the production of materials of war."

It may be called work-or-fight legislation.

I fully realize that the problem is a most difficult one. I have no desire whatever to be unfair to labor or deprive it of any rights. However, after all, Mr. President, in time of war all considerations must yield to the paramount question of national defense.

It is true—and I have said it time and time again—that only a small minority of the laboring people of America are not cooperating in proper measure with the war effort; but a minority can seriously interfere with the production of the essential equipment which will gain for America a victory based on an unconditional surrender at the earliest possible time.

In this day of our peril we can no longer tolerate any interference from any source whatsoever with a 100-percent utilization of all the manpower and resources of America.

Existing law provides that if an employer does not cooperate with the Government, the President has the power to seize his plant; but there is no law which prohibits strikes or controls the new and insidious methods of certain labor leaders who induce the members of their unions to absent themselves en masse, such as the vote taken yesterday by the workers at the Lockheed and Vega aircraft plants at Los Angeles to hold a 24-hour mass meeting beginning at 12:30 a. m. Wednesday in protest against the War Labor Board's delay in handing down a decision on wage demands, or to control such instances as that which occurred in the Boeing plant at Seattle last week, when 10,000 workmen, as reported by the Associated Press, left their tools and machines to demonstrate by means of a parade their intention to strike if their demand for higher wages was not approved by the War Labor Board.

It is true that this strike threat was camouflaged under what the leaders called the holding of a 24-hour general labor meeting, and will proceed to unfinished business and from then on will wait for the War Labor Board to give its decision, but the effect is the same. There was a cessation of work in these plants producing Flying Fortresses, the most needed and effective of all our implements of war.

The bill proposed may not be perfect but it certainly offers a basis for a method of control which will prevent those impediments and delays which are now occurring in the production of munitions of war using the existing machinery established by the Selective Service and Training Act.

It amends the Selective Service and Training Act of 1940, under which every male citizen from 18 to 65 years of age—from 18 to 45 for military service—has already registered. This registration was required so that those within these age limits could be utilized in the most effective manner in the prosecution of the war.

The bill provides that any man between the ages of 18 and 65 who strikes or acts in concert with other employees in such manner that their absence from work will seriously impede or delay the production of war materials, shall immediately notify his local selective-service

board to that effect, and if he fails to do so he shall be subject to the penalties imposed under the Selective Training and Service Act of 1940.

It further provides that the employers affected shall make public the names and addresses of the employees who strike, or who act in concert with other employees in such manner that their absence from work will seriously impede or delay the production of war equipment.

The bill then would provide that the local board, subject to the same appeals which now exist in the Selective Training and Service Act, may decide which is for the best interest of the country, whether such registrant shall be inducted into the armed forces, or whether he shall continue in the work in which he was engaged at the time of his act, or whether he shall be employed in some other work essential to the war effort.

The regulations of the Selective Training and Service Act already provide that any registrant who changes his place of living or his occupation shall notify his local board. Therefore the notification required in this law is entirely consistent with the underlying principle of the selective-service registration.

It is, of course, true that at the present time the armed forces are inducting into service only those between the ages of 18 and 38, so under present regulations, those over 38 who commit the acts set forth in this proposed bill would not be inducted into the armed forces, but the local boards, with the new authority provided under the proposed legislation, could compel such registrants to work either in the plant where the impediment to production occurred, or in some other essential war activity, so that the services of such registrants could be utilized to the best advantage in the war effort.

The proposed legislation would be operative only until the cessation of hostilities.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TYDINGS. I believe that one thing which the recent strike in the Boeing plant has made evident is that the War Labor Board has been rather slow in passing on disputes. Of course, if the Labor Board does not in the future act with more speed than it acted in the case to which reference has been made, it will tend to increase industrial unrest considerably. It would be unfortunate, therefore, if we were to have strikes in the future because the War Labor Board has not been quick in acting upon the disputes which have come before it.

I do not make that observation in a spirit of antagonism to anything the distinguished Senator from Virginia has said. However, some agencies which are beyond the scope of Congress should be put on notice to do what they can to prevent strikes and not give opportunity for workmen to complain that long delays cause them to suffer injustices, which may or may not be the case. I read a very interesting article on the subject by Mr. Arthur Krock. The article was published in last Sunday's New York Times. The situation seems

to be that the motivation of the strike referred to was not so much due to the issue involved as to the failure of the agency set up by the Government actually to pass upon the matter and adjudicate it in accordance with the facts. So far as we can we should serve notice on the War Labor Board that we expect it to see that strikes are not caused by delays—which have occurred in too many cases—in adjudicating matters coming before it.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Virginia yield to me so that I may ask the Senator from Maryland a question?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. How long did the War Labor Board have the matter under consideration—for 2 weeks or for 2 months?

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know the time; but my recollection is that it was several months. They were about to decide it once, and then a petition for re-examination was filed by one member of the Board. Then the Board looked into the matter a second time. If my recollection is correct, I think the strike occurred approximately 6 weeks or 2 months after the Board looked into the matter the second time. In the meantime, no decision had been handed down.

The matter of wages is at the Board's disposal. They know how much the workers are receiving; they have the formula and the procedure. It seems to me they could very quickly ascertain whether there was merit in the complaint, and could arrive at a decision. I can think of nothing more unfortunate in the trial of a lawsuit than long delay during which a man does not know where he stands. Perhaps the workmen in this case were basically all wrong, or perhaps they were all right. I am not purporting to pass on that. But at least there should be quick action by the War Labor Board so as not to create unnecessary dissension in the ranks of the workers.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Maryland that there should be no undue delay in the settlement of the question of increased wages for workers. However, I point out that the present situation is only one instance of strikes occurring throughout the country.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am simply saying that the occasion is one which will supplement the occurrence of strikes throughout the country. In the Boeing case, I think the War Labor Board contributed no small factor to the loss of 6 hours' work by each of 10,000 workmen; whereas if the decision had been promptly rendered the strike might have been prevented. The Government should be as careful as anyone else in making sure that it is not responsible for the loss of man-hours of work during the war.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, under Government regulations now existing, no employer can increase wages and salaries without the approval of the War Labor Board. A strike today in a war-industry plant for higher wages is not a strike against the employer, but is a strike



against the War Labor Board, representing the Government. It is, in fact, a strike directly against the Government itself.

I agree that an agency of the Government, such as the War Labor Board, should have authority over increases in wages. Such authority is now effective, and it is, therefore, more imperatively necessary than previously that the Congress itself, by a strong declaration of policy, decree that strikes affecting war production shall not be permitted during the war emergency. I say this because what little influence the employer once had to prevent a strike has been taken away, first, due to the fact that the employer has been deprived of the right of discharging striking employees for striking, and second, because the employer is no longer able to adjust the wages of his own employees.

The granting of wage increases involves the vital question of the control of inflation. It seems to me obvious, therefore, that if wages are to be controlled to avoid inflation, strikes must be controlled as well. There is ample governmental machinery already established to correct any injustices or inequalities in wages that now exist.

It appears to be evident that we are faced again with strikes and threats of strikes. The instance of 10,000 workers leaving their tools and machines in the manufacture of Flying Fortresses at the Boeing plant in Seattle and parading through the streets as a demonstration to secure an increase in wages under threat of strike, and the statements made by their labor leaders, give an ominous warning that unless their demand is granted, a general strike in all airplane plants on the west coast will be called.

In the East the demands of John L. Lewis for large wage increases in the coal field will come up for consideration on March 10. Recalling the victory John L. Lewis won over the Government when he was appointed an arbiter by the President to sit on his own case, the country can anticipate a determined and bitter fight by this labor leader to win the increases in wages, and other concessions he is now asking. Interruption of the Nation's coal supply, even for a short period, will strike at the very lifeblood of the war effort.

Heretofore the administration has opposed antistrike legislation, and it has been mainly due to the influence of the administration that no such protective legislation has yet been adopted by both branches of Congress.

On June 13, 1941, the Senate adopted a resolution stating that it was "the sense of Congress that strikes in industries that affect the national defense effort are contrary to sound public policy and they are hereby condemned," but due to the influence of the administration this resolution was defeated in the House.

The House, by large majorities, passed two Smith bills, which, if enacted, would have done much to curb strikes and speed the war effort, but both those bills were smothered in the Senate Committee on Education and Labor. Therefore, up to this date, there has not been a law enacted by Congress to control strikes in

war industries, which have done so much to sabotage a 100-percent war effort.

While lately effort has been made to minimize strikes, the fact is that strikes in vital war industries have been constantly occurring. In the year before Pearl Harbor, when this country was preparing for its own defense, the Labor Department reports that 23,047,000 man-days were lost in all strikes. In the year after Pearl Harbor, with the country at war, as reported by the War Labor Board, 4,565,000 man-days were lost in all industries. Of these, 2,095,294 man-days were classified as being in war industries; but the fact is that practically every strike since Pearl Harbor, and most of the strikes since the emergency began, have affected adversely the war effort, even though occurring in a plant not classified as a war-production plant. For example, today, with the impending shortage of food, a food industry is not classified as a war industry, yet a strike in any food processing plant is just as much a strike against the war effort as a strike in a war-production plant.

In the 4 weeks ending January 23, 1943, in war industries alone 258,498 man-days were lost, as reported by the War Labor Board. If this ratio continued throughout the year 1943, there would be an increase of approximately 50 percent of the man-days lost in war industries as compared to 1942.

It is true that the man-days lost since Pearl Harbor involve only a small percentage of those who work in war-production plants, which proves what I have said many times before, that a vast majority of the workmen of this country are completely loyal and are doing their utmost to promote the war effort, but this does not excuse even a minority, headed by unprincipled leaders, who are willing to sabotage the war effort if such action succeeds in advancing their own selfish interests.

In this desperate war in which we are engaged we must mobilize every resource of America, both at home and on the battlefield, to win the earliest possible victory.

Not only do we have strikes today, but it has been definitely shown that absenteeism is doing even more to retard the full war effort, and I believe this bill will do much to prevent unwarranted absenteeism.

The No. 1 job before the country is to win this war, and every day that we can shorten the war means saving perhaps thousands of American lives.

I feel the time has come when the question of strikes or unwarranted absenteeism in plants must be dealt with firmly and effectively. We must hit at the heart of the matter, and Congress should declare, by effective legislation, that we will not tolerate unwarranted absenteeism or any other stoppage of work which denies to our soldiers the equipment and material necessary to achieve the task we have given them—to defeat by unconditional surrender the most brutal yet the most efficient enemies this country has ever faced.

I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, to have printed in the RECORD as

a part of my remarks a statement from the War Production Board showing the man-days of strike idleness in all industries, as well as in war industries, again emphasizing that since Pearl Harbor a strike in any industry in practically every instance has had an adverse effect on the full war effort.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TABLE II—Man-days of strike idleness

	5-year average, 1937-41, all industries	1942, all industries	1942, war industries
January.....	923,378	390,000	46,197
February.....	796,608	425,000	118,700
March.....	1,324,084	450,000	166,680
April.....	3,334,445	375,000	173,513
May.....	2,108,529	325,000	137,330
June.....	1,763,120	550,000	254,553
July.....	1,372,769	450,000	233,614
August.....	1,346,516	450,000	268,333
September.....	1,213,114	450,000	318,892
October.....	1,274,516	325,000	167,895
November.....	1,068,113	175,000	91,925
December.....	501,162	200,000	119,572
Total.....	85,133,777	4,565,000	2,095,294
Monthly average.....	1,418,896	380,417	174,608

Mr. BYRD. I further ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD, as a part of my remarks, a very able article by Arthur Krock, appearing in the New York Times of February 28.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TIE-UP AT BOEING POSES NEW CRISIS IN WAR LABOR—MEMBERS OF CONGRESS GROW RESTIVE, SOLDIER BACK FROM AFRICA TALKS OF PLANES THAT DID NOT COME—WAGE RULING DELAYED BY WAR LABOR BOARD

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 27.—Thousands of workers in the Boeing plants on the Pacific coast laid down the tools and left the machines by which the great Flying Fortresses are made in protest this week against the length of time it has taken the War Labor Board to pass on higher wage demands.

Before wiser counsels prevailed, some of the workers' spokesmen said that, until the Board acts and acts satisfactorily, the walk-outs will continue and will be made general in the aircraft industry. This would, of course, have steadily reduced the production of airplanes on which the safety and victory of the American armed forces depend.

Congress was quick to respond to this latest breach by union members of the pledge of their leaders to abandon the strike as an economic weapon for the duration of the war. Senator CONNALLY reintroduced a bill which the administration had influenced him to withdraw some time ago in consideration of the establishment of War Labor Board and the no-strike pledge. This bill would outlaw strikes and provide for Army seizure and operation of struck war plants, with heavy penalties for the strikers. In the House related moves were made to maintain vital war production.

#### SOLDIER'S CONDEMNATION

Out at Walter Reed Hospital in Washington 14 United States soldiers, who were wounded in the north African fighting, lay in a ward and read the news from the Pacific coast. One of their number, Corp. H. V. La Rochelle, who said he was the spokesman of them all, was quoted in the local press as follows:

"We who have lain in shell holes watching the skies for bomber and fighter plane help which failed to appear feel pretty bitter about the whole thing. In the Army, acts less treasonable than this are punishable with death before a firing squad."

These things were said and done in the United States this week.

It is fair to relate that the aircraft workers on the west coast have a grievance. Since last July they have been asking the War Labor Board to pass on an application for higher pay. A conference on the subject broke down in Los Angeles during that month, presided over by Paul Porter. Contracts had generally expired between April and July for 9 plants with 250,000 employees. There followed a period of uncertainty as to the wage policy of the administration until October 2, when the Stabilization Act was passed and the War Labor Board was directed to stand by the Little Steel formula.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE BOARD

The Board then instructed Mr. Porter to pursue a further inquiry. He finished it in December and made recommendations for increases which have been before the War Labor Board ever since. But the case is hot, and the Board has been busy with the administrative work of setting up regional groups to carry out its wage policies.

The result was the delay against which the Boeing workers demonstrated. Probably they heard whispers that good unions do not get the attention from the War Labor Board that hell-raising unions do.

But also the Boeing worker leadership has been troublesome to the industry and to the country. Before Hitler attacked Russia, when, according to the Communist Party line in the United States, the anti-Axis nations which we were aiding were engaged merely in a capitalist war, there was much Communist leadership at Boeing. When Russia was bombed into an allied position, and especially after the Japanese attacked Pearl Harbor, this leadership was supplanted by an experienced, mature spokesman named Garry Cotton, who had the support of the International Association of Machinists, the parent American Federation of Labor organization. But he was not extreme enough to suit the hotheads in the local, and they replaced Cotton with H. J. Gibson, younger and lacking experience.

#### UNION'S DEMANDS

The international union, if this grave matter is not quickly settled and for keeps, can suspend the local. But then in all likelihood it will go over to the Congress of Industrial Organizations and there will be a loss of dues and no improvement in the situation. For the workers are plainly out to bully the War Labor Board in giving them more than Mr. Porter recommended. They are asking for a beginning wage of 95 cents an hour instead of the present 62.5 cents, at Boeing, and the present 60 cents in southern California. Mr. Porter has proposed: A beginning wage of 65 cents at Boeing, rising to 85 cents at the end of 16 weeks; the maintenance of the beginning wage of 60 cents in southern California, rising to 80 cents at the end of 16 weeks.

These are the general facts in the controversy which produced the things said and done in the United States this week that have been enumerated above. The President was suffering from a slight illness during the course of events, and the White House explained that, had he not been ordered by his doctors to refrain from action in any but the greatest emergencies, he would have intervened by telephone.

The President's health is more than ever of vital importance to the United Nations and the cause for which they are at war.

But when it is completely safe for him to assert himself, and if at that time there remains even the vestige of a threat that workers will close down any of the aircraft plants, however briefly, it is plain that Congress and the country will expect him to act sternly. And, from what the wounded corporal said, it seems certain that the armed forces of the United States would applaud the most vigorous action necessary.

#### DRAMA OF IMAGINATION

What will that action be, assuming that the threat of further work stoppages continues and the President has directed the War Labor Board to stand by his wage stabilization, anti-inflation policy against all strong-arm pressures? No prediction may be ventured. But imagination may be indulged, and the following dramatic act envisaged which this generation will probably never witness, chiefly because, one hopes, it will never be necessary.

All broadcast facilities are ordered to be mobilized to carry throughout the United Nations words issuing from a microphone in the White House. American Army commanders in India, China, the islands of the Pacific, South America, the Caribbean, Iceland, Alaska, Africa, and the United States are instructed to assemble as an audience all troops not engaged in battle or activities germane to battle. The Navy has directed its men to stand by to listen, wherever possible.

#### THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS

On the ground, on and under the sea, and in the air the armed forces of the United States—men and women—hear these words from the Commander in Chief:

"Henceforth there will be no work stoppages in the production of the supplies you must have to fight the war. I have directed the Army and the Navy to take over at once any war plant where there is even the semblance of a strike, a slow-down, or abnormal absenteeism.

"I have directed Selective Service to draft any able-bodied male citizen responsible for any of these shocking delinquencies, and I shall find means to deal effectively with those unfit for Army service. I shall make no further effort to restrain Congress from legislating strong correctives. I have been patient, too patient perhaps. From now on you may count on me to enforce a true equality of sacrifice and effort, as comparable to your own as I can make it."

But—it must be repeated—this is only a flight of fancy.

#### COTTON A VITAL FACTOR IN WAR

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a round-table discussion entitled "The Farmer and Victory," by Chris Christensen, T. W. Schultz, and William Spencer. The discussion took place at Chicago.

Mr. Christensen is the dean of the college of agriculture and director of the agricultural experimental station and extension service of the University of Wisconsin. Mr. Schultz is professor and head of the department of economics at Iowa State College. Mr. Spencer is the dean of business at the University of Chicago. At present he is on leave from the university, to act as director of the War Manpower Commission.

Mr. President, the discussion of the farmer and victory by these three professors absolutely amazes me. I quote first from Mr. Schultz, page 2:

Mr. SCHULTZ. We just throw those figures at ourselves all the time. There has been a very credible—

He says "credible," but I know he means "credible"—

record, I grant, in some parts of agriculture, but look at the fact that virtually half of agriculture, in terms of people, is in the South, and cotton is not needed for the war.

A college professor, a professor at an agricultural college, is making the statement that cotton is not needed for the war.

Again Mr. Schultz, on page 12 of the pamphlet, says:

Mr. SCHULTZ. You would in the case of wheat. You would in the case of several of the products that I mentioned. Let's take cotton for just a second in that connection.

A second must have been all the time they ever devoted to cotton in their entire lives.

Here we have an economy which involves almost half of the farm people of the United States. We've got so large a stock of cotton carry-over that if we didn't produce any short-staple cotton next year we'd still have plenty. You could take all the 1943 crop and dump it in the Gulf of Mexico, and you wouldn't hurt the war effort one iota.

Think of a professor of agriculture in a college making a statement of that kind, and sending it over the radio, if you please, apparently with the approval of a member of the War Manpower Commission set up in Washington.

Furthermore, we're going to use a lot of ships to bring in fertilizer from Chile to grow more cotton. That simply doesn't make sense.

Again on page 20 Mr. Spencer gives voice to this remarkable statement:

Mr. SPENCER. Gentlemen, we are agreed that the consumer has a heavy responsibility in helping the farmer do his job of producing more food as a war weapon. Certainly agriculture as a whole, notably the Cotton Belt, is not now on a wartime basis.

We are agreed that we must produce more fighting foods.

#### Listen to this:

We must produce more fighting foods, such as meat, dairy products, eggs, peas, peanuts, and soya beans.

We are agreed that in some regions and in some agricultural activities farm workers are not now being fully utilized.

We're not agreed fully as to how far the increased prices for farmers will solve this problem. We do believe that removing some of the loans on cotton production, and perhaps even in wheat, may help out, but we still will have left, after that is done, a problem of recruiting and allocating and training farmers with farm experience in order to get the food that we need.

After reading these statements of these three agricultural professors, so-called, I am wondering if some of our colleges are putting a premium on ignorance.

Of all the ignorant discussions I have ever read or heard of concerning a great agricultural product, none excels in ignorance this discussion by the three professors about cotton. It is remarkable that a man claiming to be a professor of agriculture could be such an ignoramus about one of the greatest food crops in the world. All three seem to be agreed, from the foregoing excerpts in the pamphlet that cotton is



of no food value. I suppose these professors must imagine that lint cotton only is grown. I do not suppose they ever heard of cottonseed or its value as food.

Ordinarily 1,600 pounds of short-staple cotton produce about 500 pounds of lint or, as we used to say in the far South, 1,600 pounds of seed cotton to the bale. Mind you, Mr. President, two-thirds of this cotton is composed of cottonseed. The oils and fats from cottonseed are infinitely more extensive, infinitely better as a fighting food than some of the products suggested by the three learned professors of agriculture.

The kernels of cottonseed contain the richest oil fats. The oil is used in the Army as well as in civil life. From the fat of these seeds are made lard, butter, and all the modern shortenings which are in common use, not in one State alone, not in one section alone, but all over the country. They are used in New England, they are used in the West, they are used in the Middle West, they are used right there in Chicago, and, while these gentlemen may not know it, every day of their lives, in one form or another, they eat cottonseed which they say has no food value of any kind. Furthermore, the hulls of the cottonseeds are ground and produce cattle feed which in turn produces all kinds of dairy commodities.

Mr. President, if I were inclined to be critical I would say that the ignorance of these three agricultural college professors is monumental. Probably, that, however, would be saying too much for them. They talk as if lint cotton grew by itself on the cotton plant and that such lint cotton was valueless to the world. I shall discuss that later.

I want to say first, without fear of successful contradiction, that no food products are more necessary in this war than oils and fats and that our principal oils and fats come from cotton, the three radio agricultural professors at Chicago to the contrary notwithstanding. Of course, substantially, we now get no vegetable oils from abroad at all. The supply of vegetable oil from the Far East, principally copra, was very great, but since the war these supplies of vegetable oils have ceased, so that we are now dependent upon our own vegetable oils. Until last year the quantity of vegetable oils from cottonseed was substantially as large as from all other sources combined. This year soya-bean oil is slightly ahead of cottonseed oil. In terms of pounds of meal the proportions are soya bean, 1,350,000,000 pounds; cottonseed, 1,250,000,000 pounds; flaxseed, 1,500,000 pounds; peanuts, 1,250,000 pounds. In any event, it can be safely said that more than one-third of all our vegetable oils and fats come from cottonseed. I imagine that the three agricultural professors at Chicago did not know that cotton came from seed and that two-thirds of cotton in the seed is composed of the seed. Perhaps they had never heard of cottonseed oil mills and refineries. They probably thought that lard, oleomargarine, and all other shortenings were hog lard. Of course, they did not understand that they themselves ate this product in their ev-

eryday lives and that it would have been bad for them individually for all the cotton crop of 1943 to be dumped in the Gulf of Mexico. It would not only hurt the war effort tremendously, but it would hurt as well the three radio farmers of Chicago.

#### COTTON NOT NEEDED IN THE WAR

Mr. President, I take up first the statements of these three radio farmers that "cotton is not needed for the war."

I wonder what sort of clothes the three radio farmers of Chicago wear. I wonder what sort of clothes they think the boys in the Army wear. Substantially, every shirt the soldier wears is made of cotton. Every undershirt, every pair of socks, the bag in which he carries his clothes, every piece of under apparel he wears or he uses is made mostly of cotton. The khaki uniform he wears is made of cotton. It is remarkable that any person who went to school for as much as a year does not know these facts, and yet the three radio agricultural experts at Chicago seem not to know it.

Perhaps they think that all the clothes of the soldiers are made of silk obtained from our enemy, Japan. I do not know how else they could think that our soldiers would be clothed, unless they were under the delusion that, like Mr. Jiggs, all of them wore red flannel underclothes.

Of course, they wear woolen clothes, too, but without cotton they could not go very far in the way of dress, and if the cotton crop were placed in the Gulf of Mexico, our soldiers at home and abroad, as well as our civilians, would be in a sad plight, the three radio experts at Chicago to the contrary notwithstanding.

#### FOOD USES OF COTTON

Cottonseed oil is used in butter making, the making of oleomargarine, and in the making of a great variety of compounds containing animal fat, as well as in the making of hydrogenated vegetable cooking fats. It is used for the manufacture of soaps, for lotions, creams, artificial leather, linoleum, explosives, paint, and medicine. Not only that, Mr. President, the meal and hulls are used for stock feed to greatly increase our supply of cattle, poultry, sheep, and hogs. They are used as fertilizers, and for all kinds of feed products. The oil is used for dyestuffs, but its greatest value is in food-stuffs.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McKELLAR. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I was waiting for the Senator to address himself to the use of cottonseed in the preparation of cottonseed meal and cake for the cattle industry, and hence in the production of beef. I wanted to tell the Senator that I have received several telegrams from New Mexico, which is a cattle-producing State, demanding to know why the cattle raisers there cannot buy cottonseed meal and cake to feed cattle, stating that there apparently is a shortage. Will the Senator please explain that?

Mr. McKELLAR. Explain the shortage?

Mr. HATCH. Yes. I understood the Senator to say that the college professors

were proposing that the cotton be dumped into the Gulf of Mexico.

Mr. McKELLAR. They say it could be dumped into the Gulf of Mexico without hurting the war effort. I am merely enumerating the hundreds of uses of cotton, among them the feeding of cattle, the feeding of sheep, even the feeding of hogs, for hogs, too, eat cottonseed meal. It is good food for man and beast.

Mr. HATCH. The point I was making was that apparently, from the messages I have received from my State, there is now a shortage of that product.

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes; yet these three farmer professors in Chicago, who broadcast over the radio, and who are connected with the War Manpower Commission, say that if all this year's crop, the 1943 crop, were dumped into the Gulf of Mexico, the war effort would not be hurt a bit. I wonder where the Senator's constituents would get the cottonseed meal and hulls with which to feed cattle in his State, if all that crop were dumped into the Gulf of Mexico. There would be difficulty in getting feed for stock.

Mr. HATCH. Of course, the Senator has been speaking facetiously, but he is discussing a very serious matter.

Mr. McKELLAR. I am discussing one of the most serious food situations in this country. The cottonseed crop is one of the most important of all the food crops at this time, not only in itself, but for the oils and fats which come from it, as well as because of its use in the production of meat for the whole country.

Mr. President, linters are the fiber of cotton immediately around the seed, a very short, fuzzy fiber, not over one-sixteenth or at most an eighth of an inch long, which is used for the making of gunpowder. I wonder where these three agricultural radio professors at Chicago, who are advising the American people about this matter, would get the material out of which to make gunpowder if it were not for the vast amount of linters that are taken from the cottonseed meal after the lint cotton is ginned.

If the cotton crop of 1943 were dumped into the Gulf of Mexico, I wonder what the gunpowder industry in our country would do.

These professors say cotton is not helpful to the war effort. What ridiculous nonsense. Linters not only are used exclusively at the present time in making gunpowder, but they are commandeered already by the Government. All the linters of last year's crop, and, as I understand, of this year's crop, have already been commandeered by the Government for the making of gunpowder. Yet these three professors are talking about cotton not being of value to the war effort.

In ordinary times linters are used for the upholstery of furniture and automobiles, yarns, mops, cordage, wicks, and for the manufacture of cellulose, rayon, lacquers, cellophane, and plastics. The three agricultural college professors and radio experts would not be able to function with the movies if all the cotton were dumped into the Gulf of Mexico.

There are hundreds of different uses to which both the cotton and the cottonseed products are put, notwithstanding

the statements of our three radio professors.

Mr. President, in conclusion I may say that no one knows where these statements come from, and we do not know anything about them, and I would not have said anything about them but for these three men broadcasting over the radio, one of them connected with the War Manpower Commission, talking about throwing the entire cotton crop into the Gulf of Mexico, and saying that it would not hurt the war effort at all. I thought someone should call attention to this matter.

#### BUREAUCRATIC CONTROL OF FARMS

Mr. President, I wish now to draw attention to another matter and to put into the RECORD two or three letters which I have here, one of which I read:

#### SELECTIVE SERVICE SYSTEM,

LOCAL BOARD No. 1,

Lauderdale County, February 18, 1943.

Mr. M. L. PIPER,

Ripley, Tenn.

DEAR MR. PIPER: The Lauderdale County Local Board No. 1 would like to notify you that your farm labor does not meet the requirements necessary to classify your farm as an essential farm. If you will check this at the local board office, we will be glad to help you adjust this situation, so that your essential farm help will not be drafted from your farm.

Very truly yours,

J. N. WYATT, Chairman.

I shall read an extract from a letter written by the owner of the 2,400-acre farm referred to in this letter, stating what it contains—though it is said it does not come within the war effort:

The farm that this letter is directed to is only about 112 to 115 years old—

He is very much mistaken about that; the land is older than that—

The farm that this letter is directed to is only about 112 to 115 years old, situated 4 or 5 miles out of Ripley, Tenn., and has only been owned by three different people—the first owner being a man by the name of Oldham, then the J. T. Fargasons, of Memphis, owned it, and now myself. This farm consists of about 2,400 acres and has been a stock farm for the last 60 years. On January 1, in making up our inventory, we had 309 head of cattle and 200 head of hogs. We grew the following crops in 1942: About 250 bales of cotton, 12,000 to 14,000 bushels of corn, about 100 acres of soybeans, 5,000 bushels of oats, a small acreage of wheat, and pasture of various kinds for the stock mentioned. During December and January we marketed from 25,000 to 30,000 pounds of meat, we furnished in the neighborhood of 100 tons of cottonseed for oils and other purposes, and yet this board says that this farm is not classified as an essential farm. If it is not, I would like to know what it would take to make it essential.

I ask that the entire letter be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WOODS LUMBER CO.,

Memphis, Tenn., February 22, 1943.

HON. KENNETH D. MCKELLAR,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing a letter from the Selective Service System, the same being with reference to a farm near Ripley, Tenn.,

in Lauderdale County. My reason for writing this letter is to give you an idea of what the public is having to put up with with the different agencies governing farms and other works.

The farm that this letter is directed to is only about 112 to 115 years old, situated four or five miles out of Ripley, Tenn., and has only been owned by three different people—the first owner being a man by the name of Oldham, then the J. T. Fargasons, of Memphis, owned it, and now myself. This farm consists of about 2,400 acres and has been a stock farm for the last 60 years. On January 1, in making up our inventory, we had 309 head of cattle and 200 head of hogs. We grew the following crops in 1942: About 250 bales of cotton, 12,000 to 14,000 bushels of corn, about 100 acres of soybeans, 5,000 bushels of oats, a small acreage of wheat, and pasture of various kinds for the stock mentioned. During December and January we marketed from 25,000 to 30,000 pounds of meat, we furnished in the neighborhood of 100 tons of cottonseed for oils and other purposes, and yet this board says that this farm is not classified as an essential farm. If it is not, I would like to know what it would take to make it essential.

This is one of many such things that we are up against in the way of committees, boards, regulators, and dictators, which are doing more harm than the public can do good. There are millions of working hours lost in trying to do business with the many agencies that have been set up in the past few years. I am one who would quit trying to do anything if we were not at war until such things were corrected.

We bought the farm referred to about a year ago, and during the year we have marketed over 200 head of hogs and in the neighborhood of 120 to 125 head of cattle in addition to the crops above referred to. We also operate two sawmills and furnish the majority of our output for Government purposes. We have some additional farm interests in Arkansas, with which it very nearly keeps a man busy going to the county agencies and different regulating boards to try to do business. Much of this was set up before we were at war.

I am one who is ready and willing to, and am doing everything in my power to promote war against our enemies, but we find many things done by Government agencies that are detrimental and retard instead of being a benefit, in the way of causing time lost, circulars to be filled out, reports to be made that do not amount to as much as the paper they are written on, for a majority of the agencies that are set up never had 5 cents' worth of business in their lives, would not know what a pay roll was if they were to see one, and there are thousands sitting back in a big, easy chair in front of a desk that do not do anything but put in time and draw the Government pay. Our armed forces could be increased by several hundred thousand if they were put in the Army instead of put behind a desk, and maybe could do something to promote our war effort.

I am writing this letter in the kindest of spirit, but giving facts as we see them, and we think something should be done in this way to encourage the public to produce instead of taking up their time with inexperienced people making reports.

I hope you will pardon my writing you this long letter.

Yours very truly,

EUGENE WOODS.

Mr. MCKELLAR. Mr. President, this is what comes from legislation by bureaus. This shows the action of a bureau chief, small, it is true, but a bureau chief. The information used comes from Washington. He says that a 2,400-acre farm, producing all those foodstuffs, including cotton, is not essential to the war effort! When I think of it, I feel

that perhaps we should abolish all the bureaus, without exception. We would hardly make a mistake.

#### MANPOWER AND THE FARM-LABOR PROBLEM

Now, Mr. President, I wish to refer to something else, and it will take me but a moment.

I have obtained from the Washington News an article about bureaucratic farming which I wish to read. On page 26 I find the headline "McNutt's job safe, says man whose orders turned on heat." The article reads:

Picking on War Manpower Chairman Paul V. McNutt has taken on the proportions of a national pastime during the last fortnight—yet the man who initiated most of these "directives" which fanned up this fury so far has escaped the heat.

He is Fowler Harper, deputy War Manpower Commission chairman and former professor at Indiana University law school, where Mr. McNutt was one-time dean.

Mr. Harper was the first of a long line of Hoosier schoolmen Mr. McNutt brought to Washington. Professor Harper's first assignment was as general counsel for the Federal Security Agency. He took that position shortly after Mr. McNutt was made administrator. Later he returned to Indiana University, but made weekly trips here as one of the expert professional "consultants."

Let me state what I understand these consultants to be. Senators will recall that we had much to say last year about travel pay. We could not conceive how the travel pay had grown. I am told it grew up in this way: The bureaucrats here, when they did not know what they wanted to do, would call for an expert consultant to come. The consultant would come here and put up at a hotel, his entire expenses would be paid at the hotel, his mileage would be paid, then he would get \$23 a day, as I remember the amount, for the time he remained here. Sometimes he would stay a week, sometimes a month, sometimes 6 months. It was wholly indefinite, merely another way of putting on employees. But that was not what I desired to discuss.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I am very much interested in what the Senator is saying about the pay of consultants. He says they were paid \$23 a day.

Mr. MCKELLAR. That was the testimony before our committee, as I remember it.

Mr. HATCH. They had no fixed salary whatever?

Mr. MCKELLAR. I understand a sort of consensus of opinion has grown up in the bureaucracies that reputable consultants should be paid \$23 a day.

Mr. HATCH. Yes, but they were not on a regular annual salary basis?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Oh, no.

Mr. HATCH. They were on a per diem basis?

Mr. MCKELLAR. Yes, and it is placed under the head of "Travel pay." That is why the travel-pay item looks so large. I give this as a prelude to what follows, and I wish Senators would listen to what Mr. Harper said about the way they manage picking the cotton crop:

We can send thousands of sharecroppers and others from Arkansas and Tennessee to do this work.

I ask the Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] to think about that. We all



remember the provision of the thirteenth amendment to the Constitution. I think I can quote it fairly accurately:

Neither slavery nor involuntary servitude \* \* \* shall exist within the United States or any place subject to their jurisdiction.

I continue to read what Mr. Harper said:

We can send thousands of sharecroppers and others from Arkansas and Tennessee to do this work—

Mr. Harper explained—

But the cotton planters do not want them, although they seem willing to take Mexicans.

I do not know what the situation is in Arizona.

Mr. HATCH. All I can say about my own State of New Mexico is that the only problem of labor we have is getting sufficient labor. There is no preference anywhere.

Mr. McKELLAR. I continue to read:

But the cotton planters do not want them, although they seem willing to take Mexicans. All we ask is that they pay them 30 cents an hour, which is what the Mexicans got last year. Surely Americans should be as adequately paid as this imported labor and the price is not so high compared with wartime cost of living.

Mr. Harper feels that absenteeism is the latest overworked word of the wartime critics.

Mr. President, I am not criticizing the war. I think the war is progressing well. I am delighted at the way the war is proceeding. I am a thousand percent for it. The main business in this country is to defeat Hitler and the Japanese and the—well, the poor Italians need hardly to be mentioned, because they are already defeated. The great thing is to win the war. But I am opposed to involuntary servitude anywhere in the United States.

I was not old enough to take part in the enactment of the thirteenth amendment, but I am for it. I am for the whole Constitution. I think it is just as effective in war as it is in time of peace. I am for the Constitution a thousand percent. I want the Government conducted under the protection of the Constitution, and under the protection of all of it, and I say that the War Manpower Commission, and no other commission, has a right to take people from Tennessee and Arkansas—I refer to those States simply because they are mentioned in the article from which I am reading—and send them someplace else where the War Manpower Commission may think it is better for the people generally to take them.

I am opposed to involuntary servitude, and I regret that the War Manpower Commission gives out such a report as this.

In order that there may be no mistake about the matter, I ask unanimous consent that the article in question be printed in the RECORD at this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The article is as follows:

HE'S NOT TOO MUCH CONCERNED—McNUTT'S JOB SAFE, SAYS MAN WHOSE ORDERS TURNED ON HEAT

(By Daniel M. Kidney)

Picking on War Manpower Chairman Paul V. McNutt has taken on the proportions of a national pastime during the last fortnight—

yet the man who initiated most of the "directives" which fanned up this fury so far has escaped the heat.

He is Fowler Harper, deputy War Manpower Commission Chairman and former professor at Indiana University law school, where Mr. McNutt was one-time dean.

Mr. Harper was the first of a long list of Hoosier schoolmen Mr. McNutt brought to Washington. Professor Harper's first assignment was as general counsel for the Federal Security Agency. He took that position shortly after Mr. McNutt was made administrator. Later he returned to Indiana University, but made weekly trips here as one of the expert professional "consultants."

Like other New Deal and pro-labor professors, he was named as a public representative on one of the War Labor Board panels.

Finally he returned here for his present full-time job as War Manpower Commission deputy chairman, a \$9,000 post.

#### KNOWS LABOR LEADERS

In these various roles he has become well acquainted with industrial labor leaders from coast to coast and often confers with them, as well as with management, regarding manpower problems.

These contacts in the field have served to develop the present War Manpower Commission program which is causing much controversy in Congress and throughout the country. Mr. Harper isn't especially perturbed by the criticism, and says he feels there is not much substance to the various reports that Mr. McNutt is to be replaced.

"The last Congress kept nagging Mr. McNutt for not doing anything," Mr. Harper said. "Now they are nagging him about his doing too much. The 48-hour week and the work-or-fight plan are things which inherently develop pressures. So this heat is not unexpected and might even be called legitimate."

#### COMPLEX JOB

"Ours is an incredibly complex job and whatever we do will be tough on various groups affected. Classifying certain jobs as not necessary in wartime is bound to make persons employed in such fields resentful. But if this is an all-out war, we have to go all-out to win it and that means using every bit of manpower for its best wartime purposes."

An example of the power now wielded by War Manpower Commission is the fact that the Army rescinded its order to send several thousand troops into Arizona to pick cotton when Mr. Harper protested to both the War Department and Agriculture.

"We can send thousands of sharecroppers and others from Arkansas and Tennessee to do this work," Mr. Harper explained. But the cotton planters do not want them, although they seem willing to take Mexicans. All we ask is that they pay them 30 cents an hour, which is what the Mexicans got last year. Surely Americans should be as adequately paid as this imported labor and the price is not so high compared with wartime cost of living."

Mr. Harper feels that absenteeism is the latest overworked word of the wartime critics.

#### NOT LIKED BY POLITICOS

"We have been working on that problem for many months," he said. "Through the co-operation of union labor and management I established a program in the lumber industry at Seattle which has worked out extremely well. These are things which we are doing all the time."

Professor Harper isn't the kind of person who ever will do much to make the former Governor of Indiana a President of the United States. He almost automatically arouses the prejudice of the type of democratic politicians who control conventions.

Frank M. McHale, Indianapolis attorney and the 1940 manager of the McNutt-for-

President campaign, probably wouldn't call on Paul if he thought Professor Harper was in the same building.

Having spent all his life in school or teaching, until he took up new dealing on the McNutt staff, he has none of the "don't take life too seriously" of the politico who came up from the post of precinct committeeman.

Mr. Harper is married and has a daughter in high school here.

Mr. McKELLAR. Before I take my seat I wish to say that my distinguished friend the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN], one of the best legislators we have, has come into the Chamber, and I should like to ask him whether he is in favor of the War Manpower Commission taking laborers in Arkansas and Tennessee and bringing them out to his State, with or without their consent, and putting them to work picking cotton in his State? I do not believe the Senator is.

Mr. HAYDEN. Of course not. What actually happened was that there was a shortage of labor to gather the Arizona cotton crop. The Farm Security Administration recruited some, but not enough, cotton pickers in various parts of the United States; some in Arkansas, some in Missouri, some in Tennessee, and more from Texas. They came out to Arizona after the cotton was ready to be picked, and as everyone who has had any experience in cotton picking knows, when most of the cotton bolls are fully open a man can pick more pounds of cotton per day, because there is more available cotton on each cotton plant. Particularly is that true of the long-staple cotton, which sometimes grows nearly 6 feet high.

The cotton does not all ripen at the same time. So pickers have to go back at a later date and make a second picking.

In the second picking the picker cannot make as much money per day, because he has to go to more plants to get the cotton. In the third picking, the last of the crop, he cannot make nearly as much each day as he could in the first picking.

The persons who were imported from other States came out and picked the first part of the Arizona cotton crop, but when it came down to the third picking they were not there, because they could not make the big money that they had earlier in the season. That is the truth about it.

It was officially reported to me that on the 11th day of February, there were 7,500 bales of extra long-staple American-Egyptian cotton, planted at the request of the Army, which is needed to make blimps, which is needed to make parachute cloth, which had not been picked. There also was 13,000 bales of Acala cotton, the staple of which is about an inch long, that had not been picked on that date. All of both varieties of Arizona cotton that should have been at the gins under normal conditions around Christmastime, certainly by the 15th of January. It was not picked by the middle of February, and some of it will not be picked at all, but will be lost.

Mr. McKELLAR. There will not be a great deal of it, will there? As I

understand there were 7,000 bales of the long-staple cotton not picked?

Mr. HAYDEN. About 7,500 bales had not been picked two and a half weeks ago, and the time for planting this year's crop is practically at hand.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Arizona recalls seeing in the newspapers that it was first thought to send the Army out there to pick the cotton, but it was found that there was not enough cotton to justify such an attempt.

Mr. HAYDEN. Let me explain the Army feature of the situation to the Senator.

Mr. McKELLAR. I hope the Senator will.

Mr. HAYDEN. About 3 weeks ago General McNarney, the Assistant Chief of Staff, made the statement that the Army would not agree to furlough individual soldiers to engage in the harvesting of crops but that the Army would make military organizations available to assist in the harvests; that is, send them out to the farms by companies or battalions. A statement to the same effect was made, I think, on the following day by General Marshall. Realizing that this idea of harvesting crops by organized bodies of troops was something new and untried, I made the suggestion to General McNarney that as an experiment, in order to find out how to do it, some of the extra long staple cotton planted in Arizona at the request of the War Department be picked. I did not argue that it was necessarily an emergency matter, because perhaps a considerable part of it could be picked in the course of time, and what was lost in any event would not be an enormous quantity. But I did insist that any new scheme has to be tried out, just like any newly invented machine, for, as the mechanical engineers say, there are always "bugs" in it that have to be worked out.

If soldiers go out to help farmers harvest their crop, the first question is, Shall the grower pay as much for the service rendered as he would pay to anyone else who gathered it, whether it be corn, wheat, soybeans, or cotton? Everyone who stops to think about the matter would not hesitate to say that the farmer should not gain by having soldiers perform the work at a cheaper rate than if it were done by civilians.

The second question is this. When the farmer has paid for the harvesting work, who gets the money? Does the soldier who personally picks the cotton get the money? Or does it go into the Treasury of the United States? My suggestion was that it go into the company funds, so that the soldiers could buy more boxing gloves, or baseball bats, or perhaps have better Christmas dinners, or for any other purpose for which company funds are maintained. It was distinctly understood that no military organization was to be engaged in harvesting crops for any very long period of time so that the sums paid into the various company funds would not be excessive.

The next proposition is: How are the soldiers to be transported from where they are to the place where they do the work? The place where the fields to be harvested are located may be nearby

some Army camp to which the soldiers can return at the end of each day. In the case of the wheat harvest it may be that they may have to be taken many hundreds of miles. There is the problem of transportation, the problem of what shall be taken along in the way of tentage and equipment and how the soldiers are to be fed. It is obvious that there are many details to be worked out in a practical way.

My suggestion to the War Department was not wait until next summer or fall when some great emergency arises, but that the services of soldiers be utilized in an experimental way by gathering the remainder of a crop of cotton, every bale of which the Army very greatly needs for blimps, for parachutes, and for other types of equipment where great tensile strength is required. That was the essence of my proposal. It was agreed to by the Army, and was agreed to by the officials of the Department of Agriculture directly in charge of the procurement of farm labor. The objection came from Mr. Harper of the War Manpower Commission. He knew nothing of the facts upon which the proposal was based. But he had not been consulted, and he therefore objected to anything being done. As a result of his personal intervention the order authorizing the use of troops to assist in the picking of long staple American-Egyptian cotton in Arizona was canceled.

Mr. McKELLAR. That is another case of bureaucracy. Let me say to the able Senator from Arizona that if he, as a boy, had experience in the picking of cotton, as I did, he will recall that the first crop is very nearly the best; the middle crop is the second best, and the last crop, which is known in cotton parlance as the "top crop," looks very much better than it is. I should not be surprised if the Senator's estimate concerning the top crop of cotton in Arizona is much less than 7,000 bales. I am also sure that if the Senator has had experience with cotton, as I have had, he knows that the statement which I have made is true. The so-called top crop looks better than it really is.

Mr. HAYDEN. My information came directly from the chairman of the Department of Agriculture war board in Arizona. I asked him to make a check and give me an accurate report. I have confidence in his figures. Whether the unpicked crop is 2,000 bales, 5,000, or 7,000, it offers an excellent opportunity to try out an experiment and ascertain whether soldiers in organizations can successfully harvest crops. There is grave doubt in my mind about that. I do not believe that the use of a company of soldiers, only a few of whom may have at any time picked cotton, would be very efficient. That is particularly true with regard to the harvesting of wheat, when it is necessary to use binders and combines, the handling of which requires skill and experience with agricultural machinery. The only way to find out is actually to make the experiment. My idea is that by a process of trial and error the Army can find out whether the use of companies of soldiers to harvest crops is a worth-while

way of proceeding. If it proves not to be satisfactory, we will all know that some other method will have to be adopted when a real harvesting crisis arises next summer or next fall. That is the whole idea I had in mind.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as a part of my remarks on this very interesting subject I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an article appearing on page 8 of today's Washington Daily News, written by Mr. Arthur F. DeGreve, quoting Mr. Bernard Baruch. He expresses the same view I hold regarding involuntary servitude and commandeered labor.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUT HE BELIEVES IN WORK OR FIGHT—BARUCH STILL BRANDS LABOR DRAFT SLAVERY

(By Arthur F. DeGreve)

Bernard M. Baruch, adviser to Presidents and one-time international financier, clings to his belief of nearly a quarter of a century—that it would be impossible and dangerous to attempt to draft labor for war work. But he also is still convinced that labor can be compelled to work or fight.

The white-haired Baruch received this correspondent in the hotel suite he uses as an office when the weather precludes conferences in a nearby park. The interview came as a Senate committee prepared to begin hearings on the Austin-Wadsworth bill which would draft, with some exceptions, all men between 18 and 65 and women between 18 and 60 for war work if they did not volunteer.

CLEARLY \* \* \* SLAVERY

Baruch said his views are the same as those he expressed to Congress in World War No. 1, when he headed the War Industries Board, and in a memorandum to a joint congressional and Cabinet commission on organization for war in 1931.

"We have heard a good deal of a slogan: Draft every dollar, everything and every man," he said 12 years ago. "The attempt to draft labor is \* \* \* impossible and dangerous \* \* \* a soldier serves the Nation directly. There is but one master in the case and that master is America. He serves to profit no one but the country as a whole. There is no distinction between him and his comrades. He enters an immemorial status. His destiny is not contractual. He is clothed, fed, housed, and attended."

Baruch contended that industry is in the hands of millions of private employers and its employees, therefore, serve in private industry operating for gain.

"Enforced and voluntary services for a private master is and has been clearly and repeatedly defined by our Supreme Court as slavery," he pointed out.

BEATS CHAIN GANG

While the Government cannot say to an employee, "work here, work there," Baruch emphasized that it can say "work or fight." He noted that this principle was barely invoked in the First World War and is capable of immense expansion.

"The work or fight method," he declared, "is compatible with our present institutions and far more effective than any chain-gang impression that could be invented."

He feels that strict application of a work or fight policy would go far toward solving absenteeism and unauthorized strikes.

Baruch has no official status but is credited with considerable influence on home-front war policies. He is a close friend of Stabilizer Byrnes and Chairman Harry Hopkins of the Munitions Assignment Board—two of President's Roosevelt's closest advisers.



## HINTED FOR WAR PRODUCTION BOARD HELM

Recently, when Production Chief Nelson struggled with the services over control of arms scheduling, it was reported that the President would remove Nelson and appoint Baruch as his successor. Subsequently it was reported that Baruch would be named to a new superboard to handle broad policies affecting the civilian economy.

Friends said today that Baruch is seeking no wartime Government job, but they added that he feels he could not refuse to serve in any capacity if called upon by the President.

## INCREASE IN PAY OF POLICEMEN AND FIREMEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 17) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, will the Chair state the question before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I believe I should clear the record on at least two points which were mentioned by the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN]. He made reference to what he thought might be a critical paragraph in the minority views. I wish to assure him that it was not a criticism of his conduct of the committee business, or his leadership of the committee. As I have already stated, I applaud his leadership. I appreciate the way in which he has devoted his time and attention to the work of the committee. I found it necessary merely to make mention of the situation outlined in the report for the reason that I was submitting the report of a minority, and I thought that unless I made some reference in the report to the attendance at the meeting at which the issue was raised, my report as a minority of one might be misunderstood.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I think the question is appropriate. It is agreed, is it not, that the Senator did not submit his substitute at the time the bill was under consideration by the committee?

Mr. BURTON. No, Mr. President. At the committee meeting I asked that a vote be taken upon the very question which I am presenting here. I did not have the proposal in writing, but I asked that the same provisions that were in House bill 6386 be reported. My request was voted down by a vote of 3 to 1. I was emphasizing the smallness of the attendance, in a committee of 15, to justify the minority report of one.

Turning to another point, the Senator referred to the action of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. I do not wish to spend much time on that question except to say that in their letter of February 6, 1943, which I shall ask to have printed in the Record, the Com-

missioners stated that they are not opposing raises in pay. They are recommending the passage of my substitute, and they quote in their letter the statement which they made in January 1942 when a similar situation was before them. They based their objection on the discrimination which would have resulted from the passage of House bill 6386 at that time, which discrimination would not exist if my proposal should be adopted. I quote the following paragraph from their letter of January 22, 1942, which is quoted in their letter of February 6, 1943:

The Commissioners take the position that if the rise in the cost of living in the District of Columbia justifies increases in basic salaries, such increases should be only for the duration of the national emergency, or so long as the high cost of living prevails, should be on a percentage basis and should apply to all affected by the cost of living in the District.

Since that time the increased cost of living has been met for other employees of the District of Columbia by the 10-percent bonus provision. Therefore, I believe that my substitute is directly in line with the steps previously taken by the Congress. The reason the President vetoed the previous bill was because he differed with the general policy of the Congress at that time to make the increase permanent and to date it back to an earlier date.

The gist of my argument is that the police and fire departments need an increase. We voted an increase last December on a permanent basis. It was recommended by the department on a permanent basis. I urge the renewal of that vote. I have shown that the proposed rates of pay, even when adjusted to the cost of living, are consistent with the rates of pay in cities comparable to the District of Columbia. As we approach the question at the present time, if we adopt the committee bill the rates of pay will be out of line with those of District employees who are receiving the 10-percent bonus; they will be out of line with the pay of employees of the United States Government who are receiving the 10-percent bonus. Representing the Committee on Civil Service, which is discussing these matters, I think I should urge the point that we should not go out of line in our discussions, based on what is good for the whole United States, and for the other employees of the District of Columbia at the present time. But if different consideration is to be given the District of Columbia, it should be done only after the whole question has been considered by the Congress. Therefore, I urge that the Senate repeat the step previously taken. In doing so we will justify the District of Columbia Commissioners in declining to increase the cost by 50 percent, as would be the case if the proposal of the majority of the committee were adopted.

Mr. President, I urge the adoption of the proposed substitute amendment because it is in line with what we have done for other Federal employees as well as for other employees of the District of Columbia. To do otherwise would be out of line with what has already been done.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Record at this point as a part of my remarks the letter from the president of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia dated February 6, 1943, to which reference has already been made.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

FEBRUARY 6, 1943.

HON. PAT McCARRAN,

Chairman, Senate District Committee,  
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have given consideration to S. 17, a bill "Providing for a temporary adjustment of salaries of the Metropolitan Police, the United States Park Police, the White House Police, and the members of the Fire Department of the District of Columbia."

At the time of the preliminary meeting of your committee, the Commissioners suggested as a substitute for S. 17 a bill which would grant to members of the Police and Fire Departments an increase in pay conforming strictly with the standards established by Joint Resolution 170, namely, 10 percent of the pay of any member of either organization up to and including \$2,900, with a proviso that in no event should any member receive additional compensation which would make his pay exceed \$5,000. The Commissioners recognized the equity of an increase in pay for the members of the Police and Fire Departments, but felt that any increase granted them should conform to Joint Resolution 170. The substitute proposal of the Commissioners would give to the Police and Fire Departments an increase commensurate with that accorded the classified employees of the District, and would do away with the discrimination which would result from the passage of S. 17. In addition, the proposal of the Commissioners would satisfy the principal objections of the President to H. R. 6386 in that the substitute bill would make the increase effective as of December 1, 1942 (instead as of February 1, 1942), and would provide that the increase should continue for a temporary period.

Since the meeting of your committee at which S. 17 and the proposal of the Commissioners were discussed, two additional substitutes have been suggested, one of which would increase the pay of each policeman and fireman by \$350, up to and including Inspectors in the Police Department and Battalion Chiefs in the Fire Department (resulting in an over-all increase of approximately 15 percent), and the other a substitute bill by Senator BURTON which is substantially the same as H. R. 6386, which passed the Congress but was vetoed by the President with the suggestion that with the elimination of certain objectionable features the President would be favorable to the legislation therein proposed.

The objections of the President have been met by the substitute proposed by Senator BURTON, in that the substitute would provide for a temporary, instead of a permanent, increase, and make such increase effective as of December 1, 1942 (instead of February 1, 1942). Furthermore, bills are now pending before the Congress which would provide for an increase in pay for school teachers, which would remove the final objection of the President. The substitute likewise conforms substantially to Joint Resolution 170 by providing for an over-all increase of approximately 10 percent, and on a temporary basis.

The Commissioners, in their report to the chairman of the House District Committee on January 22, 1942, objecting to the passage of H. R. 6386, stated in part as follows:

"As stated in our report on the former bill, if it is fairly established that living costs in the District of Columbia have risen sufficiently to justify increases in the pay of firemen and policemen, such facts would also justify increases in the salaries of other District employees, as well as employees of the Federal Government. The proposed legislation aids a select few without regard to the level of compensation of other employees.

"The Commissioners take the position that if the rise in the cost of living in the District of Columbia justifies increases in basic salaries, such increases should be only for the duration of the national emergency, or so long as the higher cost of living prevails, should be on a percentage basis, and should apply to all affected by the cost of living in the District."

These objections have been removed by the passage of Joint Resolution 170, which provides for a temporary increase in pay for a substantial number of District employees, and the amendments made to H. R. 6386 in the proposed substitute of Senator BURTON.

The Commissioners recommend, therefore, that the substitute bill proposed by Senator BURTON be adopted.

Respectfully,

President, Board of Commissioners,  
District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment reported by the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gerry	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gillette	Overton
Ball	Green	Radcliffe
Bankhead	Guffey	Reed
Barbour	Gurney	Revercomb
Barkley	Hatch	Reynolds
Bone	Hawkes	Russell
Brewster	Hill	Stewart
Brooks	Holman	Taft
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Burton	La Follette	Thomas, Okla.
Bushfield	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Butler	Lodge	Truman
Byrd	Lucas	Tunnell
Capper	McCarran	Tydings
Caraway	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	Maloney	Wagner
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
Ferguson	Murray	White
George	Nye	Wiley
	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-two Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON] in the nature of a substitute for the amendment proposed by the committee.

On this question the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] has demanded the yeas and nays. Is the request sufficiently seconded?

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DAVIS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the

junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER]. Not knowing how he would vote, I withhold my vote.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], the Senators from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN and Mr. McFARLAND], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILEOL], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER], and vote. I vote "nay."

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. McCLELLAN].

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS].

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent on account of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness. If present he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 40, nays 31, as follows:

#### YEAS—40

Alken	Gerry	Revercomb
Austin	Green	Russell
Ball	Guffey	Taft
Bankhead	Gurney	Thomas, Idaho
Barbour	Hawkes	Thomas, Okla.
Brewster	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Brooks	Lodge	Tydings
Buck	Maloney	Vandenberg
Burton	Maybank	Wherry
Bushfield	Millikin	White
Butler	Moore	Wiley
Byrd	Nye	Wilson
Danaher	O'Daniel	
Ferguson	Reed	

#### NAYS—31

Barkley	Hill	Radcliffe
Bone	Holman	Reynolds
Capper	La Follette	Stewart
Caraway	Langer	Thomas, Utah
Chavez	Lucas	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	McCarran	Wagner
Eastland	McKellar	Wallgren
Ellender	Mead	Walsh
George	Murray	Wheeler
Gillette	O'Mahoney	
Hatch	Overton	

#### NOT VOTING—25

Andrews	Bilbo	Chandler
Bailey	Bridges	Clark, Mo.

Connally	McClellan	Shipstead
Davis	McFarland	Smith
Downey	McNary	Tobey
Glass	Murdoch	Van Nuys
Hayden	Pepper	Willis
Johnson, Calif.	Robertson	
Kilgore	Scrugham	

So Mr. BURTON's amendment, in the nature of a substitute for the amendment of the committee, was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill S. 17 was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

#### TEMPORARY ADJUSTMENT OF SALARIES FOR TEACHERS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 18, providing for temporary adjustment of salaries of teachers in the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be read by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (S. 18) to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries for teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Nevada that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill to provide for a temporary adjustment of salaries for teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, for the duration of the war and for 6 months thereafter, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia, with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause, and insert:

That any employee of the municipal government of the District of Columbia whose rate of compensation is covered by the act entitled "An act to fix and regulate the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia," approved June 20, 1906, as amended, and as further amended by Public Law No. 188 of the Sixty-eighth Congress, approved June 4, 1924, as amended, shall be paid additional compensation at a rate of \$350 per annum: *Provided*, That each such employee shall be paid only such additional compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of \$5,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. The provisions of this act shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and remain in effect for the duration of the present war and for 6 months thereafter.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I send to the desk an amendment in the nature of a substitute, and ask that it be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.



The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. It is proposed to strike out all except the enacting clause, and insert the following:

That teachers and all other educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia whose salaries are fixed in the Teachers Salary Act, approved June 4, 1924, as amended, shall be paid additional compensation amounting to 10 percent of so much of their earned basic compensation as is not in excess of a rate of \$2,900 per annum, and each such employee shall be paid only such additional compensation or portion thereof as will not cause his aggregate compensation to exceed a rate of \$5,000 per annum.

SEC. 2. This act shall take effect as of December 1, 1942, and shall terminate on April 30, 1943, or such earlier date as the Congress by concurrent resolution may prescribe.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I desire to discuss the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Before the Senator does so, if the Senator from Nevada desires to make a statement regarding the bill, he should proceed to do so at this time.

Mr. BURTON. I am very glad to have the Senator from Nevada discuss the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this matter may be disposed of quite promptly. The same argument which was indulged in with reference to the bill relating to the police and fire departments applies with equal force to the bill relating to pay for teachers.

The lowest pay for teachers in the District of Columbia is \$1,400. Because of that low salary, it is impossible to fill the quota for teachers in the District. The increase proposed by the substitute will effect about the same result in the lowest salary brackets for teachers as was effected by the bill adopted by the Senate in regard to policemen. In other words, what the Senate is doing is adding more starvation to those who are already starving. The Senate has just voted a \$100 increase to men who are getting only \$1,900 and a much larger increase to men who are getting from \$2,400 up to \$3,600. The same thing applies to the teachers' bill. If the Senate is to be consistent, it might just as well adopt the substitute, and have it over with.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I shall take but a moment to express this thought: At the last session of Congress the teachers of the District of Columbia were the one group that were not granted a temporary increase of pay. The substitute provides for them precisely the same increase of pay as was voted for the other Federal employees and the other employees of the District of Columbia. It will last until April 30, 1943, at which time there will have to be a reconsideration of the issue as to them and as to all other Federal employees. I, therefore, urge the adoption of the amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Ohio in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Chief Clerk called the roll.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER], the Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. GUFFEY], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. MCFARLAND], and the Senators from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK and Mr. THOMAS] are detained on official business for the Senate.

The Senators from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS and Mr. PEPPER], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. BILBO], the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS] has a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES].

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] has a general pair with the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MCCLELLAN].

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] has a general pair with the Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS].

The Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] is absent because of illness. He has a general pair with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH].

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS] has a general pair with the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WILLIS], and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SHIPSTEAD] is absent because of illness. If present, he would vote "yea."

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 34, as follows:

#### YEAS—38

Alken	Ferguson	Reed
Austin	Gerry	Revercomb
Ball	Green	Russell
Bankhead	Gurney	Taft
Barbour	Hawkes	Thomas, Idaho
Brooks	Hayden	Thomas, Okla.
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Truman
Burton	Lodge	Tydings
Bushfield	Maloney	Vandenberg
Butler	Maybank	Wherry
Byrd	Millikin	White
Clark, Mo.	Nye	Wiley
Danaher	O'Daniel	

#### NAYS—34

Barkley	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bone	Hill	Reynolds
Capper	Hoiman	Scruggam
Caraway	La Follette	Stewart
Chavez	Langer	Tunnell
Clark, Idaho	Lucas	Van Nuys
Connally	McCarran	Wagner
Davis	McKellar	Wallgren
Eastland	Mead	Walsh
Ellender	Murray	Wheeler
George	O'Mahoney	
Gillette	Overton	

#### NOT VOTING—24

Andrews	Guffey	Pepper
Bailey	Johnson, Calif.	Robertson
Bilbo	Kilgore	Shipstead
Brewster	MCClellan	Smith
Bridges	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Chandler	McNary	Tobey
Downey	Moore	Willis
Glass	Murdoch	Wilson

So Mr. BURTON's amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide additional compensation for teachers and all other educational employees of the public schools of the District of Columbia whose salaries are fixed in the 'Teachers Salary Act.'"

#### WAR LOAN DEPOSIT ACCOUNTS—SUSPENSION OF ASSESSMENT AND RESERVE REQUIREMENTS

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to consider Senate bill 700, proposing to amend the Federal Reserve Act.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 700) to amend section 12B and section 19 of the Federal Reserve Act during the continuance of the war and for 6 months after its termination, which had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. WAGNER obtained the floor.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from New York yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber. I think the bill sponsored by the Senator from New York need not involve much controversy, but following that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] desires to have a bill considered. Whether we finish these bills this afternoon may determine whether the Senate will have to meet tomorrow or may go over until Thursday. I hope Senators will remain in the Chamber.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I suppose it might be said that the bill now before the Senate is rather technical in its nature, so I propose to make a brief statement, and after completing my statement, of course, I shall be willing to answer any questions which may be propounded, if I am able to answer them.

The measure now before us, Senate bill 700, provides that for the duration of the war and 6 months thereafter so-called war-loan deposit accounts shall be relieved from Federal Deposit Insurance assessments and also from reserve requirements. It was introduced by me at the request of the Chairman of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, Mr. Crowley, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, Mr. Eccles. Its enactment is intended to improve the machinery for the Government's war financing. It has also the approval of the Treasury, of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, and of the System's open-market committee.

War-loan accounts were originally authorized by the Second Liberty Bond Act of September 24, 1917. The law provides that the Secretary of the Treasury may deposit in such incorporated banks and trust companies as he may designate any proceeds arising from the sale of bonds and certificates of indebtedness, Treasury bills and War Savings certificates authorized by the Liberty Bond Acts. Most of the Government bonds purchased by banks, insurance compa-

nies, and other large investors, as well as the Defense and War Savings bonds sold to the public, have been issued under authority of the Second Liberty Bond Act and the various amendments thereto.

Incorporated banks and trust companies may qualify for war-loan accounts by applying to the Treasury through the Federal Reserve banks, and such accounts are secured by a pledge of bonds. The Treasury determines the maximum which may be on deposit in any account at any one time. When banks which have qualified for war-loan accounts subscribe to Government securities for their customers or for themselves, they enter the amount of their allotted subscriptions in the war-loan accounts on the payment dates. The balances in these accounts are subject to call by the Treasury. Subsequently, as the Treasury has need for funds, calls are issued. The calls consist of giving notice to the banks to transfer to their respective Federal Reserve banks whatever percentage of the funds in the war-loan accounts is required by the Treasury to meet its current expenditures. Thus the war-loan accounts are drawn down gradually as Treasury needs arise. The money is then checked out of the Reserve banks by the Treasury in payment of the Government's expenses. As the money is spent by the Government, checks are received by contractors, businessmen, and others who deposit them in the various banks throughout the country. Thus the money previously withdrawn from the banks flows back into the banking system as privately owned deposits.

The Federal Reserve banks act as the Government's fiscal agents, and all payments made by the Treasury are charged against its accounts in the Federal Reserve banks. As a matter of Treasury policy, the balances in these accounts are kept down as much as possible. They just keep feeding those accounts into the Federal Reserve banks as the Treasury needs the money, so that the maximum amount of funds is kept within the private banking system.

If there were no such mechanism—that is, if all banks upon subscribing to Government securities for their customers or themselves were required to transfer the funds in payment of their subscriptions immediately to the Federal Reserve banks—there would be periodic, heavy drains on the deposit totals and reserves of the banking system, with serious disruptive effects on the Government bond market. The larger the financing operation, the greater and more disruptive the drain would be. In peacetime, when the Government was not compelled to raise and expend such huge sums as are demanded by war and when the banks had superabundant reserves, the situation, of course, was very different. But today when the Treasury must go to the public and to the money market for large sums of money every few months, and when reserve requirements are repeatedly increased as bank deposits increase, it is very important to extend the war loan deposit mechanism as wisely as possible throughout the banking system.

If there were no such mechanism, it would be necessary to pump billions of reserves into the banking system to offset the heavy drains at financing periods, and as the funds were spent by the Government and flowed back into the banks as deposits, the reserves which had been pumped in would become excessive in relation to the current need.

Any such scarcity and redundancy of reserve funds would create difficult problems for the Treasury and the Reserve System. To the extent that the war-loan account mechanism exists throughout the banking system such difficulties can be avoided, and the flow of deposit reserves into the war-loan accounts, then to the Federal Reserve banks as the Treasury needs and calls for the money, then back into the banking system as the Treasury expends the money, is accomplished smoothly and without disruptive effects. There is a close adjustment and a minimum time lag between the drawing down of the money and its flow back into the deposit structure.

Because of this consideration, the Reserve System has made a special effort and a concerted drive, through all of the Reserve banks, to induce as many banks as possible to apply and qualify for war-loan deposit accounts. The results so far have been gratifying, and a large number of banks, fifty-six hundred, have applied and qualified for these accounts, even though they may have felt that the war-loan accounts should not be subject to deposit-insurance assessments or to reserve requirements. There are still many thousands of banks which have not as yet used war-loan accounts, and it is clear that the requirements of existing law, which the pending bill would suspend for the duration, are a deterrent in many instances. Not only is a more widespread setting up of this convenient and necessary mechanism thus impeded, but banks that have war-loan accounts are discouraged from utilizing them as fully as would be the case if these statutory requirements were suspended. Neither requirement existed when war-loan accounts were originally authorized by Congress in the last war. We had no deposit insurance at that time, and war-loan accounts were not subject to reserves before the year 1935. If this measure is enacted I feel sure that the mechanism will be widely set up and generally utilized to facilitate the large financing operations which are ahead of us as long as the heavy requirements of the war situation continues.

The time element of the enactment is important. If we have large financing operations in April, which is now in contemplation, the problem of financing will be greatly increased unless this bill is enacted in the meantime and we are successful in increasing and expanding war-loan accounts. Prompt passage of this measure is urged in order that the Treasury and the banks may have time to complete the necessary arrangements for the banks to act as war-loan account depositories before the next financing takes place.

At present the War Loan Deposit Account is a demand deposit and the Fed-

eral Reserve member banks must carry reserves against these deposits. Central reserve city and reserve city banks must carry a reserve of 20 percent and country banks a reserve of 14 percent. All member banks carry a reserve of 6 percent against time deposits. The statutory requirements were 3 percent on time deposits and 13 percent on demand deposits of central reserve city banks, 10 percent on demand deposits of reserve city banks and 7 percent on demand deposits of country banks. The Federal Reserve Board had power to double all reserve requirements and it did so, so that country banks now carry 14 percent and reserve city banks 20 percent against demand deposits. Last fall, because of war financing, requirements for central reserve city banks were reduced from 26 to 20 percent, which is the same percentage required for reserve city banks on demand deposits.

Mr. President, that concludes my statement. Unless Senators desire to ask questions about the bill, I have nothing further to say.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Apparently the enactment of the bill will, to some degree, reduce the premium income of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Can the Senator tell me to what extent that will happen?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not have the figures before me. Mr. Crowley, however, was not disturbed about it. He appeared before our committee. I think Mr. Crowley stated at the time that the elimination of the assessment requirement would perhaps affect the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to the extent of about two and one-half million dollars.

Mr. VANDENBERG. So I understand that the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation approves the measure?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Has the Senator explained section 2 of the bill?

Mr. WAGNER. With reference to the reserve?

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. WAGNER. I think I did. I hope I did.

Mr. VANDENBERG. What is the effect, in a word, of section 2? Is it to suspend reserves on war bond deposits?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes, only on war bond deposits.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The first committee amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 1, line 8, after the word "That", it is proposed to strike out "during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after its termination," and insert in lieu thereof, "until 6 months after the cessation of hostilities in the present war."

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New York a question. The bill addresses itself to the insurance of bank deposits?

Mr. WAGNER. Yes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would the Senator kindly state what his conception is as to the spirit and the intent of the law passed



by the Congress for the insurance of bank deposits? Was it for the benefit of insuring banking corporations, or was it for the benefit of the people?

Mr. WAGNER. For the benefit of the people, of course.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. That leads me to another question which comes to my mind due to a condition which has arisen under my own observation in my own State. Mr. Crowley has arbitrarily said that the people of a particular community in my State cannot have the benefit of the bank deposit-insurance law because—and what is to follow is my own interpretation—because, I take it, that Mr. Crowley does not like the Bank of America. I do not know whether or not my conclusion is correct, but I believe it be well founded based on the acts of Mr. Crowley. The people of my State, and the people of the State of New York, and the people of every other State are entitled to have their deposits insured, and when they set up a banking institution under the laws of their State they should know that they can have the benefits of the law enacted by the Congress. Mr. Crowley, who by the way, as I understand, is not even under salary from the Government, but is highly salaried by a private institution, says the people of my State cannot have the benefits or the rights under that law. Does that conform with the ideas of the able Senator from New York?

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know enough about the facts to decide that particular question, but when we had hearings upon the measure which is now before the Senate the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM], a member of the committee, made inquiry of Mr. Crowley with reference to this very situation, and Mr. Crowley said that he had ample justification for what the Corporation did with relation to the one bank, one branch of which, I think, is located in Boulder City and another somewhere else in the State of Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. One at Las Vegas and the other at Boulder City.

Mr. WAGNER. He said he was quite willing at any time to discuss the matter with the committee or with anyone who was interested. I read from the hearings:

Mr. CROWLEY. Well, I presume you are talking about Las Vegas and Boulder City.

Senator SCRUGHAM. Yes; and the branch at Boulder City.

Mr. CROWLEY. Well, from my understanding, our record shows in connection with that bank that all except qualifying shares are not owned locally, and that the qualifying shares that the directors have are under option by a holding company, to be purchased from them at their option at a fixed purchase price.

Senator SCRUGHAM. I understand the outstanding shares are optioned.

Mr. CROWLEY. That is a subject, gentlemen, that would take a long, long time to explore, and we do not like to have that brought up in connection with this bill.

I am sure that our Corporation, our associates, in the Federal supervisory and the regulatory fields would welcome an opportunity, if the Senate Banking and Currency Committee so wished, to be given a reasonable length of time to submit our reasons for

the stand we have all taken on the expansion of holding-company banks throughout the west coast.

I think, Senator, as far as your situation is concerned, that if those people will buy the controlling interest in that bank, which they have indicated a willingness to do, that we would be very happy to insure it. I hate to have that tied onto this bill, but I want you to know, Senator, that we would be very happy to sit down and discuss this matter with you.

I think that has to do with the matter which the Senator from Nevada has in mind.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I go back again to the first principle, and my question about it which the able Senator from New York answered correctly. Did we enact the law for the insurance of deposits for the welfare of Mr. Crowley, or to suit his whims or his caprices, or did we enact that law for the welfare of the people?

Mr. WAGNER. For the welfare of the people. Of course Mr. Crowley must follow and obey the law.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes. But he is not following it. He is not following the spirit of the law. Here is a group of people who are supporting a bank in their community. It is the only bank in the community of Boulder City. Boulder City has been created by the Federal Government. It is a Federal city. It is supported entirely by Federal employees. It is located at Boulder Dam. The people there want to support their bank. They want to deposit their money in that bank. But Mr. Crowley says, "No, we will not give you any guarantee insurance whatsoever. You can deposit your money there at your own risk if you want to." He made the same statement with reference to the bank at Las Vegas, which is one of the largest cities in the State of Nevada. The people of Las Vegas want to deposit their money in the Las Vegas bank, that is the Nevada State Bank. Mr. Crowley says, "Yes; you can deposit your money there if you want to, but you cannot have any insurance. We will not guarantee you."

I ask the question: Was the law enacted to suit the caprice of Mr. Crowley, who is not even retained by the Federal Government, but is retained by a private concern?

Mr. WAGNER. Of course, that statement does not relate to this particular proposed legislation.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am not sure that it does not. It seems to me it does. The status of Mr. Crowley in this whole setup is very important. Is he serving the Federal Government or is he serving a private concern? Is he serving the Federal Government in the spirit of the law, or is he serving some private concern in the letter of the law? It seems to me that is very important, and it certainly will control my vote on the bill.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Of course, the subject about which the Senator from Nevada is inquiring has no direct relationship to the proposed legislation, al-

though it does affect the insurance of deposits.

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. BARKLEY. This is not simply a matter of Mr. Crowley's whim.

Mr. McCARRAN. No; but what I refer to is apparently a matter of Mr. Crowley's whim.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, what I started to say was that the position taken by Mr. Crowley as the head of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is a position which is adhered to and endorsed by all those who are connected with the Federal Deposit Insurance setup, including the supervisory agencies, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, which has no direct connection with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, but which, of course, does have an interest in the regulation of matters of this sort.

While it is true, as we all recognize, that this law was passed for the benefit of depositors, nevertheless there are certain regulations and qualifications which must be met by banks in order that they may come under the system. There are regulations of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation which have barred some banks from being insured, merely because they failed to comply with those regulations.

I do not know all the details relating to the two banks referred to, but I understand that they are not locally owned. As I understand, some of the shares of those banks which are held by the directors are optioned to be sold to someone else.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will the Senator tell me what difference that would make to the depositors?

Mr. BARKLEY. Perhaps it would not make any difference, but that is one of the regulations of the F. D. I. C.

Mr. McCARRAN. That brings us back to the same question.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not possess all the facts. All I know is what Mr. Crowley said in answer to the question of the Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] at the time the bill was before the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. I make the assertion, without fear of successful contradiction, that Mr. Crowley exercises his authority in conformity with his likes and dislikes. He has formed a dislike for a certain banking institution which has many branches located in the West. He does not propose to allow that institution to give to the people of my State the rights which the law gives them, and which the spirit of the law intended to give them.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator refer to the institution controlled by Mr. Giannini? That is the Bank of America, is it not?

Mr. McCARRAN. It is the Bank of America.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is known everywhere as the Giannini Bank.

Mr. McCARRAN. I do not know whether it is or not.

Mr. BARKLEY. Does the Senator say that no bank in that group has been

insured by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

Mr. McCARRAN. If any banks are to be insured, why not the banks of Nevada?

Mr. BARKLEY. Each bank, of course, must stand on its own bottom.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well, but that objection has not been raised with respect to the banks in Nevada. They are simply told, "You cannot have insurance."

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, this matter was before the committee when the committee considered the proposed legislation. Strictly speaking, it has nothing to do with the pending legislation. However, at the suggestion of the junior Senator from Nevada, our committee agreed that at another time we would hear Mr. Crowley with regard to the situation mentioned, and that satisfied the junior Senator from Nevada at the time.

Mr. McCARRAN. It does not satisfy the senior Senator from Nevada.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know what more we can do.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. In the instance of the Nevada banks, Mr. Crowley may be guilty of everything which the able senior Senator from Nevada has said, but I do not wish to allow the Senator's indictment to stand as a generality, because I have had a great deal to do with Mr. Crowley in connection with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation. If I ever saw an intelligent administration of a public trust, if I ever saw an earnest, enlightened effort to deal with the subject to the best possible advantage to the Nation, I have seen it in connection with what has been done under Mr. Crowley in every instance which has come to my attention.

Frequently there have been violent disputes as a result of the application of decisions of the F. D. I. C. to some given state of facts. However, so far as the general attitude is concerned, as reflected in the public service of Mr. Crowley, in this particular assignment—again declining to apply what I have said to the Nevada situation, because I know nothing about it—I assert from a very close connection with Mr. Crowley's public service that I think he is one of the ablest, fairest, and best administrators I have seen in my 15 years of public service.

Mr. WAGNER. I agree with everything which the distinguished Senator from Michigan has said.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New York yield to the Senator from Maryland?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I wish to endorse everything the senior Senator from Michigan has just stated in regard to Mr. Crowley.

I invite the attention of Senators to the fact that when the pending bill was

under consideration by the Committee on Banking and Currency Mr. Crowley appeared before the committee and testified. Mr. Eccles, of the Federal Reserve Board, also appeared and testified. The matter was gone into very carefully, and no opposition developed to the bill at the time. The committee acted favorably upon it by unanimous vote.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, in view of what has been said about the F. D. I. C., I should like to quote some figures relating to what has occurred since the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation came into existence. Incidentally, the permanent plan of insurance became effective August 23, 1935. The Senator from Kentucky knows something about its history.

The total income of the F. D. I. C. from 1934 to 1942 was \$406,000,000.

The assessments paid in by banks were \$319,000,000.

The income from investments was \$87,000,000.

The total expenses paid and losses charged off by the F. D. I. C. were \$80,000,000.

The total insurance loss and expense was \$50,000,000.

The total administrative expense was \$30,000,000.

The surplus of the F. D. I. C. on December 31, 1942, was \$326,000,000.

The capital of the F. D. I. C. on December 31, 1942, was \$289,000,000.

The capital paid in by the Treasury on December 31, 1942, was \$150,000,000.

The capital paid in by the Federal Reserve banks, equal to one-half of the Federal Reserve banks' surplus, on January 1, 1933, was \$139,000,000.

I know of no institution with a record which equals or surpasses the record made by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this question is of vital importance to the State of Nevada. I do not propose to let it pass unnoticed, because it has been the subject of correspondence with Mr. Crowley, who has passed it off lightly with a wave of his hand, saying that he would take care of it. However, he never did take care of it. I know that Mr. Crowley is intent upon not giving to the people of my State what the spirit of the law intends they shall have. I do not believe that the bill should pass at this late hour in the afternoon without a thorough understanding of it. In my files, but not available at this hour, I have correspondence bearing upon the subject which I think the Senate should know about.

Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over until tomorrow so that we may discuss the whole matter at length and in the spirit of the law. I hope the Senator from New York will be agreeable to that suggestion, so that we may discuss the matter more thoroughly. I will say frankly to the Senator from New York that I did not know until a moment ago what the purport of the bill was. I did not know how intimately it affected my State. I did not know that it was a matter so closely touching the banks of my State.

Mr. WAGNER. I do not know what the Senator means by affecting the banks of his State. We now have 14,307 commercial banks and trust companies. The number of insured commercial banks and trust companies is 13,347. I assure the able Senator from Nevada that the banking situation in his State will be gone into thoroughly by the Committee on Banking and Currency. The committee so decided at its last meeting, and the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. SCRUGHAM] who is not now present in the Chamber, seemed perfectly satisfied.

The pending bill is rather important from the standpoint of War bonds which the Government is attempting to sell. We hope to expand the opportunities of sale. We want to bring in banks which, because of the assessment involved, did not feel willing to participate in the purchase of War bonds. Every day lost is a serious thing for the country.

Mr. McCARRAN. Is it so serious that the interest of the people of a sovereign State should be set aside and forgotten?

Mr. WAGNER. That question does not relate to the pending bill at all.

Mr. McCARRAN. Oh, indeed it does.

Mr. WAGNER. No; it has no relation whatever to it. The bill deals with the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and relieves certain banks from assessments because of War-bond deposits. That affects the bank at Boulder City to which reference has been made. There is nothing in the bill which would affect that bank specifically.

Mr. McCARRAN. The whole spirit of the application of the law is involved in the pending bill. When I bring to the attention of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency a situation which is being ignored by Mr. Crowley in order to satisfy his own dislike for some particular banking institution, I think it is time for the Senate to wake up to the question involved.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. All the pending bill would do would be to relieve certain deposits in insured banks from the tax which goes into the fund to pay off losses. We cannot provide by law that certain banks in Nevada shall be insured. They are not paying any taxes into the fund, and until they are insured they will not pay any taxes. So the pending bill could not possibly affect them.

Mr. McCARRAN. Why are they not paying into the fund, and why are they not insured?

Mr. BARKLEY. I presume the reason is that the banks have not met the requirements of the regulations. I have no reason to assume otherwise. I agree with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] in what he has said about Mr. Crowley. The Board of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation does not consist merely of Mr. Crowley. Mr. Crowley is the head of the board. I think the F. D. I. C. has done a magnificent job in insuring banks and in inspiring confidence on the part of the people in the safety of deposits in our banks, both National and State. If several



banks which may be branch banks or subsidiary banks of a bank located in another State have not come within the regulations of the Board, and therefore are not insured, and are paying no taxes into the fund, I say frankly that I do not see what that has to do with the pending bill. All the bill seeks to do is to remove the necessity of payment of taxes on some of the deposits which are insured. The bill would not affect at all the deposits which are not insured. I hope the Senator will not insist that the bill go over in order that he may discuss that subject.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall insist that the bill go over, because I think I would be doing an injustice to the people of my State were I not so to insist. Something must be done so that the people of any State, regardless of its size—it may be a State of small population—shall have the benefit of the rights granted by law. If Mr. Crowley is going to set himself up as a czar in this matter and is going to deny the people of my State the rights the law intends them to have, I intend to find out about it. I did not know about the hearings. If I had known about them I should have appeared before the committee.

Mr. WAGNER. I am sure that the Senator has an erroneous impression about the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no erroneous impression about Mr. Crowley, nor do I have an erroneous impression regarding the fact that he is not a Federal employee, but is being retained and employed by private concerns. I am not in error on that point.

Mr. WAGNER. The Treasury Department and the Federal Reserve Board are equally greatly interested in the bill because of what would be done under its terms. The Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation is now receiving less money than it would receive if the measure became law.

Mr. McCARRAN. I have no doubt about that.

Mr. WAGNER. If the bill were enacted into law, all banks whose deposits are insured would be eliminated from the necessity of paying the assessment tax. All banks, including the banks in the Senator's State, would be relieved from that necessity.

Mr. McCARRAN. But I want deposits in the banks of my State insured.

Mr. WAGNER. The pending bill does not relate at all to the question of insuring bank deposits.

Mr. McCARRAN. But I want them brought under its terms so they will be insured.

Mr. WAGNER. The bill has nothing to do with that question. All the pending bill would do would be to provide that, so far as war-loan deposits were concerned, the insured banks would not be required to pay into the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation the one-twelfth of 1 percent assessment. The bill has no relation at all to the subject matter about which the Senator is disturbed. The junior Senator from Nevada himself immediately realized that to be so, and said: "It is true that it has

nothing to do with that situation; so we shall defer until another time."

I agreed, and the committee agreed, that we would hear Mr. Crowley on the very situation to which the Senator refers. The committee could not be fairer than that; because there is nothing in the pending bill which would in any way affect the situation about which the Senator has been speaking.

Mr. McCARRAN. I know that the Senator believes he is correct in that statement.

Mr. WAGNER. In what respect does the Senator believe I am mistaken?

Mr. McCARRAN. But I should like to have an opportunity to know what the hearings were, at least. Let me say that the Senator is not to blame for the fact that I am bringing up the matter, because I did not know until just now that the bill was to be considered today.

Mr. WAGNER. The bill does not in any way or in any respect refer to the situation about which the Senator is complaining. That is why I appeal to him not to cause delay in acting on this measure, which is very important, because we shall soon have another war-loan drive.

Mr. McCARRAN. Will it be between now and Thursday?

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say to the Senator that if we do not dispose of the bill today, I shall move that the Senate meet tomorrow.

Mr. McCARRAN. That will be all right.

Mr. BARKLEY. I was hoping that the Senate might dispose of the pending bill and of one or two other bills today, and not meet tomorrow. But if the measure must go over to a subsequent day, I shall ask for a session tomorrow.

Mr. DANAHER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WAGNER. I yield.

Mr. DANAHER. I should like to point out two things which may have a bearing on the points raised by the Senator from Nevada. Regardless of whether they do have pertinency at this moment, they should be considered in connection with any further discussion of the matter.

In the first place, Mr. Crowley said—and I read from page 16 of the hearings:

This—

Meaning the Nevada bank situation—has been kind of a thorn in our sides for a long, long time, and we feel quite definite about it, since all of the supervisory forces and the Securities and Exchange Commission are in accord, and if this committee has any requests, we would be glad to prepare our testimony and our charts and show you why we have taken the stand we have taken on that matter.

Then I turn to one further factor, which is subsection "g" of the Federal Reserve Act compilation. I read from page 54:

The factors to be enumerated in the certificate required under subsection (e)—

Which deals with the requisites to be considered in insuring banks—

and to be considered by the Board of Directors under subsection (f) shall be the follow-

ing: The financial history and condition of the bank, the adequacy of its capital structure, its future earning prospects, the general character of its management, the convenience and needs of the community to be served by the bank, and whether or not its corporate powers are consistent with the purposes of this section.

Let me also remark that any bank seeking to be insured must elect and file notice of election and willingness to be bound by the regulations of the F. D. I. C., which of course are issued pursuant to the warrant of the law.

Therefore, I respectfully suggest that in one or more particulars Mr. Crowley intimates that the banks mentioned by the Senator from Nevada have failed to qualify. One of the points he certainly stressed was that the stock ownership of the Nevada banks was optioned, that only a few qualifying shares were owned locally, that all the remaining capital structure—insofar as the corporate shares represented evidence of ownership—were apparently outside the control of the banking system of the State of Nevada.

Please understand that I am deducting much of the foregoing from the testimony submitted by Mr. Crowley. I do not know that it controls; but I do say that there are factors between the F. D. I. C., created by law, and the applying banks which very properly may militate against their being eligible for insurance at all.

But regardless of whether there are any such factors, I respectfully suggest to the Senator from Nevada that the matter very properly should be gone into by the Committee on Banking and Currency. Mr. Crowley has said he is willing to have the committee do so. The chairman of the committee, the Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER], has said he is willing to have the committee take such action, and speaking as a minority member of the committee, I am quite willing that it be done.

So I respectfully add that in any case, regardless of whether the banks are insured, the matter certainly does not bear on the question of whether we take out of an assessment base the balances created by the United States Government for its convenience in serving as a possible attraction to banks all over the country to participate in our war financing efforts. After everything is said and done, that is all the bill is intended to accomplish.

Therefore, to the extent that the bill will aid in the war effort, it is an essential and necessary measure, and in no way relates to whether banks in Las Vegas or Boulder City are eligible for insurance.

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I was about to make a suggestion. If possible, I desire to satisfy the Senator from Nevada; because he is entitled to a hearing on the matter. If the Senator will select any time satisfactory to him, I will call a meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee, so that the whole matter may be threshed out. I shall be glad to have the Senator select any time he prefers.

As has been so ably stated, the bill in no way relates to the grievance which the Senator from Nevada has in mind; and even if we were to postpone passage of the bill, the Senator would find in the end that there is nothing in the measure which would affect the situation he has in mind. I am quite willing now, if the Senator from Nevada will agree, to arrange to have the committee meet on next Tuesday, a week from tomorrow. If that time is satisfactory to the Senator, the Committee on Banking and Currency will meet then, and we shall have Mr. Crowley before us, and the Senator from Nevada and his colleague will be there, and the matter will be discussed before the full committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Of course, I am not sufficiently in touch with the situation to be able to select a particular date.

Mr. WAGNER. I want to extend every courtesy of the committee—

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is always courteous.

Mr. WAGNER. But I realize the danger of delaying the passage of the pending bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Would there be any gross danger in delaying the matter until the next session of the Senate?

Mr. WAGNER. In the conduct of the war, every day counts. We are anxious to have a very large subscription, and we want to add to the number of banks which we are sure will utilize these facilities if we eliminate the assessment provision.

Mr. McCARRAN. I respectfully suggest that no great harm can result from having the matter go over to the next legislative day. Whether that be tomorrow or Thursday, I have no right to designate.

Mr. WAGNER. I respectfully suggest that every day counts.

Mr. McCARRAN. Every day counts to my people, too.

Mr. WAGNER. It is not particularly Mr. Crowley who is concerned about the situation.

Mr. McCARRAN. But it is Mr. Crowley who is dominating the situation, and Mr. Crowley's likes and dislikes are entering into the situation.

Mr. WAGNER. Oh, no.

Mr. McCARRAN. I am afraid the Senator has not been sufficiently advised.

Mr. WAGNER. I am advised with reference to the pending bill. The request has come from the Treasury, which is concerned with obtaining a large subscription.

Mr. McCARRAN. I shall respectfully ask that the bill go over until the next legislative day. Whether that be tomorrow or Thursday, I have no right of designation. But I should like to go into the subject. I say frankly to the Senator from New York that until this moment I had no idea that a bill of this nature was coming before the Senate. Had I known it was before the Senator's committee, I should have been there.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator's colleague is a member of the committee.

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. And he took particular pains to inquire of Mr. Crowley

about the particular situation to which reference has been made. Let me ask the Senator from Nevada whether, if the bill shall go over to the next legislative session, which will be tomorrow if we cannot dispose of it today, he will be satisfied with disposing of it tomorrow. He could discuss the matter he wants taken care of, I suppose. There is no amendment which could be offered, and no legislation which could be enacted, which would affect the situation in which he is interested.

Mr. McCARRAN. The bill is susceptible of amendment.

Mr. BARKLEY. We cannot decide in the Senate whether the banks to which the Senator has referred should be insured.

Mr. McCARRAN. No, indeed; not at all.

Mr. BARKLEY. I myself have no objection to the bill going over until tomorrow, but I should not want to have it go over until Thursday.

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well; I shall be satisfied with anything that will give us time enough to look into the matter.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is about 5 o'clock, and I suppose the bill might as well go over until tomorrow.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. RADCLIFFE. Mr. President, I wish to move to have a bill on the calendar considered.

Mr. BARKLEY. The Senator may ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside so that he can ask that another bill be considered, if the Senator thinks the bill can be disposed of this afternoon, so that it would not interfere with the pending bill tomorrow.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. I may say to the Senator from Kentucky that there are two bills which I wish to have considered, which, so far as I am informed, are not controversial, though there are a number interested in them. I have no way of knowing how long consideration of the bills will take, but I do not suppose it will take long. They were reported from the committee unanimously. One or two amendments have been offered to one of the bills since it was reported.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is rather doubtful whether at this hour a new bill should be taken up if it involves controversial questions. I do not know whether the Senator's bills are controversial. The Senate will meet tomorrow, and I wonder whether the Senator would be accommodated in any way if the bills went over until tomorrow.

Mr. RADCLIFFE. That would be entirely agreeable.

#### TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN THE CLASSIFIED SERVICE

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the pending business be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider Senate Resolution 84. It merely makes a request for information from the Civil Service Commission. I cannot imagine there will be any objection to it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Virginia? The Chair hears none, and the pending bill is temporarily laid aside. The clerk will read the resolution.

The resolution (S. Res. 84) submitted by Mr. BYRD on January 21, 1943, was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the President of the Civil Service Commission is requested to prepare and submit to the Secretary of the Senate detailed monthly reports for the month of January 1943 and each month thereafter up to and including April 1943 with respect to (1) the number of employees of the various executive departments and agencies released or transferred to other departments and agencies pursuant to section 2 of the joint resolution entitled "A joint resolution extending until April 30, 1943, the period for which overtime rates of compensation may be paid under the acts of June 28, 1940 (54 Stat. 676), October 21, 1940 (54 Stat. 1205), and June 3, 1941 (55 Stat. 241), and for other purposes," approved December 24, 1942; (2) the number of vacancies which have been allowed to remain unfilled subsequent to the date of enactment of such joint resolution; (3) the savings in salaries resulting from such reductions in personnel; and (4) the instances in which such reductions were made possible by the adoption of a 48-hour workweek.

#### SIZE OF THE ARMY

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, Thursday last I introduced Senate bill 763, to amend the Selective Service Act by exempting married men with children. Some criticism has been made of the proposal, on the ground that it would tend to limit the size of the Army, and also that no civilian should have anything to say about the size of the Army.

I call attention to an editorial in the New York Times of February 26. Certainly the New York Times could not be called an isolationist newspaper, because it consistently supported the administrations' foreign policy, both before and after Pearl Harbor.

The editorial from the New York Times reads as follows:

#### SIZE OF THE ARMY

It is the administration's decision that we need an army of 8,200,000 by the end of this year. The Navy, the marines, and the Coast Guard are planning for 2,600,000. This would make a total just short of 11,000,000 men planned for our armed forces by the end of 1943.

Spokesmen for the Army imply that this decision is irrevocable. Many of them cannot understand why the decision should be even questioned. They seem to assume that those who do question it want to fight a soft war and not a hard one. They imply also that the decision made by the Army is an expert decision, and that any questioning of it must necessarily be inept.

But the questions nonetheless continue. They increase rather than diminish. The fact that the War Department itself has just been forced to consider the question of assigning troops to help pick cotton is simply one more indication that the questioning has not been baseless.

It is not for laymen to decide what the size of the armed forces should be. But the country must be satisfied—and it has not yet been satisfied—that the question has been decided on the right principles and by the right method. Advocates of an 8,000,000-man army have put forward, as if they were conclusive, arguments which are not in fact



conclusive. We are told, for example, that the Axis commands an estimated land strength of 510 to 605 divisions; that the United Nations can muster only an estimated 395 to 505 divisions against them; and that therefore we must have so-and-so many divisions to turn the balance. We are told that 13½ percent of the German population is in the armed forces, and that we must therefore put a similar percentage into our armed forces.

These figures involve a considerable element of guesswork. We do not, in fact, know precisely how many fully trained and equipped divisions the Axis today can muster. We do not even know how many fully trained and equipped divisions our Russian ally now commands. But regardless of the accuracy of these figures, they are being put forward with an implication that must be questioned. This is the implication that a nation's total effectiveness in war is measured primarily if not wholly by the number of men it can put into uniform. This is clearly not true. The number of a nation's army divisions symbolizes its total effectiveness in war only on the assumption that its war effort is a balanced one. If we have less than the largest possible number of men in the armed forces under a balanced war effort, then we are falling below the standard demanded by total war. But if we have more than this number in the armed forces, they are there only at the cost of other aspects of an essential war program.

It does not follow, for example, that an American Army of 10,000,000 would necessarily be twice as effective in winning the war as an army of 5,000,000. It could, in fact, be considerably less effective. The real question is one of a proper internal balance. Raw materials and manpower are limited; whatever is used in one direction cannot be used in another. The steel and man-hours that go into tanks mean just that much less for merchant ships, and vice versa. The men that go into the Army mean just that many men fewer for the production of food, clothing, mechanized equipment for the Army, or the production of transport ships and escort vessels to carry the Army. Every man added to the armed forces, in short, not only means one man more to supply; it also means one man less to supply him.

It is from this point of view that the problem must be considered. When we so consider it, it is clearly fallacious to assume that our effort can be compared with the German effort simply by comparing the number of men each nation puts into a standing army. If we are to land troops on or near the European Continent and to keep them properly supplied, our war effort becomes necessarily different from the German war effort. A far greater percentage of our strength must necessarily go not merely into manning and building a Navy, but into manning and building troop transports, freighters, and tankers. These become our lifeline. Upon the maintenance of that lifeline the whole effectiveness of our Army depends.

But to create and maintain this lifeline requires thousands of merchant seamen, who at present are not counted as members of our armed forces, though they play a role no less vital. It requires thousands of shipbuilders to turn out this merchant fleet. It requires, behind these, the workers in the steel mills, in the iron mines, the workers on a hundred accessories of all sorts that go into ships. Behind these, in turn, are the farmers. And as Louis Bromfield remarked in a recent letter to this newspaper, "Without food, all the ships and planes and tanks and soldiers are worthless." None of the workers on ships, in factories, on the farm, is in uniform; but all are as vital in our total war effort as the men who are in uniform.

When we take this over-all view, we can see why it is that the Army leaders alone are not qualified to be the sole and final judges of the size of the armed forces. It is not

enough for the generals to say that we need so many men, or for the admirals to say that we need so many ships. Obviously, other things in proportion, an army of 16,000,000 men would be twice as effective as an army of 8,000,000. Other things equal, 400 new destroyers would be twice as effective as 200 new destroyers. And so on. But other things never can be equal. If we make our Army larger, we must make some other part of our war effort smaller. This applies to any part of our war effort whatever.

That is why in total war the problem of the size of the armed forces is one that can be worked out only by the joint study and consultation of military, economic, agricultural, and industrial experts. The question involved is not at all what the total size of our war effort ought to be. This ought obviously to be as great as we can possibly make it. The real question concerns the internal balance of our war effort. Even before we have begun to realize the ultimate goal of induction set by the armed forces, there is already admitted to be on all sides a serious labor shortage. What intelligent and responsible questioners of the plans for ultimate armed forces of 11,000,000 are asking is whether the proper food authorities, farm authorities and specialists in many other lines were consulted, and whether proper weight was given to their opinion, before the Army figures were arrived at.

Total war is a military problem. But it is much more. It is a problem of a nation's total economy. And experts on that economy must be consulted on every major decision no less than purely military experts.

Mr. President, I call attention to the fact that statements have been made before the Committee on Military Affairs to the effect that if we are to have an army of 11,000,000 men we will take four-fifths of the able-bodied men of this country between the ages of 18 and 38. That would mean that we would take four-fifths of the married men of the country between 18 and 38 with children.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to remind the Senator that replacements, normal replacements and replacements made necessary by battle casualties, would probably take the other fifth in a little over a year, which would mean that the present plan is to take all the able-bodied men between 18 and 38.

Mr. WHEELER. I think that was substantially the testimony which came out before the committee. So that it would mean that practically all the physically fit men between 18 and 38 would be taken into the armed forces.

Mr. President, when certain officers appeared before the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry I questioned them on the point of why they exempted physically fit single men between the ages of 38 and 45. The answer was that the greater percentage of the men between those ages could not stand up as well under war conditions as the younger men. It should be remembered, however, that when they are considering men between the ages of 38 and 45 they are considering them from the standpoint of combat service. It is well known that there will be perhaps more than a million and a half men, probably many more than that, who will not be used in actual combat service but who will be used in other than combat service. I cannot

understand why Army officials wish to exempt physically fit single men between the ages of 38 and 45, and take all the physically fit married men between the ages of 18 and 38, who have children. If that is done it will result in breaking down completely American home life. The wife in such a family will, in order to make a living—unless she can live with her folks or has money of her own—place her children in an institution, at least during the daytime, while she goes to work to support them. The very rock upon which the Government is founded is the American home. The very foundation of democracy in this country is the American home. While the men are fighting for democracy in some other country it is proposed to destroy the American home by taking from it the head of the family, the father whom the children need for advice and counsel just as much as they need their mother.

Mr. President, I shall never be able to subscribe to any policy of that kind. Let me say that if such a policy is to be followed, then, much as I am opposed to the measure proposed by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and by Representative WADSWORTH, I feel that we shall have to do what they propose in their bill. It will be necessary to turn over to the Federal bureaucrats in Washington the right to say where every farmer, where every merchant, where every laboring man, and where everyone else shall work, in what particular place, and as Mr. Baruch is quoted as saying in this afternoon's newspaper, that means slavery.

Mr. President, last summer I was talking with a group of farmers in my State. One farmer said to me "Why do you not conscript labor?" I said to him "You are a farmer, are you not?" He answered "Yes." I said to him, "How would you like to have some bureaucrat in Washington to say to you, 'You are on a piece of land which is not very fertile. You are living upon what is less than an economic unit from an agricultural standpoint, and we are going to take you from it, remove you from your home, and make you work for someone who has a much better and larger farm?' How would you like to have some bureaucrat say to the corner groceryman 'We are going to take you by the scruff of the neck, remove you from your store, and make you work for the A. & P., because your store does not comprise an economic unit?'"

Mr. President, what would such action mean? It would mean that in this country we would have the very thing against which we are fighting—there would be a dictatorship, a Fascist government.

Before the Congress of the United States decides upon a program such as has been outlined, I believe we had better stop and think not only of its immediate effect but we had better ascertain where we in the United States are drifting. We had better be sure where this course is going to take us. We want to be sure whether it is necessary to go to the extent of destroying the American home in order to carry on a successful war.

Mr. President, someone has said, "Of course, the American people are willing

to make any sacrifice which is necessary in order to preserve democracy." I agree with that statement. In order to save democracy in the United States, every man, woman, and child, regardless of age, marital relations, or economic conditions, would be perfectly willing to make any sacrifice necessary. But we are not simply called upon to support an American Army. We are called upon to send Russia a tremendous amount of food and ammunition. It has been testified that 1,500,000 tires were sent to Russia alone last year. We are sending food to north Africa to civilians and to the Army alike. We have to send food to England. We have to send equipment to South America. We have to send equipment to India, to Australia, to China, and practically all over the world. To begin with, we said we were going to be the arsenal of the democracies of the world. Is it possible for us, without destroying democratic institutions in the United States of America, to be the arsenal of the world, to be suppliers of food for the rest of the world, and at the same time furnish the men to fight in the four corners of the world? That is the problem as I see it.

Mr. President, while I am as anxious to win the war as is any other Member on the floor of the Senate, or anyone in the Government, whether he is a bureaucrat or in any other position, first of all I want to see constitutional government and democracy preserved in the United States; I do not want to lose it while we are fighting for a utopia and for a quart of milk for every child throughout the world.

#### EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HILL in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Kildroy P. Aldrich, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice Ambrose O'Connell; and sundry postmasters.

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

The following-named captains to be rear admirals in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the date stated opposite their names:

Ernest L. Gunther, August 11, 1942; and Spencer S. Lewis, August 15, 1942.

By Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Military Affairs:

The following-named officers for appointment in the Regular Army, under the provisions of section 23 and section 24e of the National Defense Act, as amended:

To be first lieutenants, Medical Corps, with rank from date of appointment

First Lt. Albert Junior Bauer, Medical Corps Reserve;

First Lt. John Barry Brady, Medical Corps Reserve;

First Lt. Arthur Abbott Kirk, Medical Corps Reserve; and

Sundry officers for promotion and/or appointment, by transfer, all in the Regular Army.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

#### AMERICAN-MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edgar E. Witt, of Texas, to be a member of the American-Mexican Claims Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Samuel Marshall Gold, of New York, to be a member of the American-Mexican Claims Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Charles F. McLaughlin, of Nebraska, to be a member of the American-Mexican Claims Commission.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Michael W. Straus, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### ALASKA

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edward L. Bartlett to be Secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask that the nominations of postmasters on the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, with nearly all the members present, unanimously voted to report favorably the nomination of Kildroy P. Aldrich, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Postmaster General. It is very desirable to have the nomination confirmed as soon as possible. I ask unanimous consent that the nomination may be confirmed now, though it is not on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The nomination will be stated.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Kildroy P. Aldrich, of Illinois, to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department, vice Ambrose O'Connell.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, has the nomination been reported from the committee?

Mr. McKELLAR. Yes. It was approved by all the members present. I think nearly all the members of the committee were present. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] moved that the nomination be favorably reported, and it was unanimously reported by the members present.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the nomination? The Chair hears none, and, without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

#### THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the nominations in the Navy be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Navy nominations are confirmed en bloc.

#### THE MARINE CORPS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations for appointment and promotion in the Marine Corps.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask that the Marine Corps nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Marine Corps nominations are confirmed en bloc.

That completes the calendar.

Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith of all confirmations of today.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, March 2, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 1, 1943:

##### COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The following-named employees of the Coast and Geodetic Survey to the position indicated:

TO BE HYDROGRAPHIC AND GEODETIC ENGINEER WITH RANK OF LIEUTENANT COMMANDER IN THE COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

Leonard C. Johnson, from the 1st day of March 1943.

John Bowie, Jr., from the 1st day of March 1943.

Ector B. Latham, from the 1st day of March 1943.

George R. Shelton, from the 16th day of March 1943.

Ira T. Sanders, from the 24th day of March 1943.

Edward R. McCarthy, from the 24th day of March 1943.

Francis B. Quinn, from the 24th day of March 1943.

Emil H. Kirsch, from the 26th day of March 1943.

##### WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

Dr. Frank H. Sparks, from the State of Indiana, to be Director, Bureau of Manpower Utilization, at \$8,000 per annum, in



the Washington office of the War Manpower Commission.

Lawrence B. Fenneman, from the State of Maryland, to be area director, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Maryland area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Farrell Daniel Coyle, from the State of Rhode Island, to be area director at \$6,500 per annum, in the Providence area office of the War Manpower Commission.

James P. Blaisdell, from the State of California, to be area director at \$6,500 per annum, in the San Francisco area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Frederick R. Whitney, from the State of Massachusetts, to be head manpower utilization consultant at \$6,500 per annum, in the Boston regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Frank M. Bristow, from the State of Missouri, to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum, in the Kansas City regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Samuel M. Derrick, from the State of South Carolina, to be field supervisor at \$5,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Ramy B. Deschner, from the State of Missouri, to be area director at \$5,600 per annum, in the District of Columbia area office of the War Manpower Commission.

William J. Fitzgerald, from the State of Connecticut, to be area director at \$4,600 per annum, in the New London area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Stanley N. Bailey, from the State of California, to be assistant area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Walter L. Sundstrom, from the State of Washington, to be senior training specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Seattle area office of the War Manpower Commission.

Elmer K. Delp, from the State of New York, to be senior training specialist at \$4,600 per annum in the New York regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

A. Frederick Smith, from the State of Florida, to be senior economist at \$4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

James J. Carney, Jr., from the State of Florida, to be program control technician at \$4,600 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

Orland V. Steele, from the State of Washington, to be senior administrative officer, at \$4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office of the War Manpower Commission.

#### APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

##### TO FINANCE DEPARTMENT

First Lt. Percival Stanley Brown, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1937.

##### TO AIR CORPS

Second Lt. Leroy Hugh Watson, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 11, 1941.

#### PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

##### MEDICAL CORPS

##### To be colonels

Lt. Col. Edward Augustus Coates, Jr., Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 1, 1943.

Lt. Col. James Albertus Bethea, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 4, 1943.

Lt. Col. Asa Margrave Lehman, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 5, 1943.

Lt. Col. Oramel Henry Stanley, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 8, 1943.

Lt. Col. Sewell Munson Corbett, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 9, 1943.

Lt. Col. Samuel Reilly Norris, Medical Corps, with rank from March 11, 1943.

Lt. Col. Benjamin Norris, Medical Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 12, 1943.

##### To be captains

First Lt. David Paul Ward, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 5, 1943.

First Lt. Edwin Emmons Corcoran, Medical Corps (temporary captain), with rank from March 8, 1943.

#### VETERINARY CORPS

##### To be colonels

Lt. Col. Allen Chamberlain Wight, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 24, 1943.

Lt. Col. Elwood Luke Nye, Veterinary Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from March 24, 1943.

#### CHAPLAINS

##### To be captains

Chaplain (First Lt.) Roger Dace Russell, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 30, 1943.

Chaplain (First Lt.) John Frederick Gaertner, United States Army (temporary major), with rank from March 30, 1943.

#### APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY

##### MARINE CORPS

Platoon Sgt. John F. Coffey, United States Marine Corps, a meritorious noncommissioned officer, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 16th day of December 1942.

Andrew M. Zimmer, a citizen of Indiana, to be a second lieutenant in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of December 1942.

The following named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 23d day of February 1943:

William F. Mazlack, a citizen of Indiana, Richard A. Kelly, a citizen of Massachusetts, Preston S. Marchant, a citizen of South Carolina.

Jackson C. Turnacliiff, a citizen of Minnesota.

#### CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 1, 1943:

##### POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT

##### FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Kildroy P. Aldrich to be First Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department.

##### AMERICAN-MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

##### TO BE MEMBERS OF THE AMERICAN-MEXICAN CLAIMS COMMISSION

Edgar E. Witt  
Samuel Marshall Gold  
Charles F. McLaughlin

##### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

Michael W. Straus to be First Assistant Secretary of the Interior.

##### ALASKA

Edward L. Bartlett to be secretary of the Territory of Alaska.

##### IN THE NAVY

##### TEMPORARY SERVICE

##### To be rear admirals

Calvin T. Durgin  
John D. Price

Andrew C. McFall

##### APPOINTMENTS IN THE MARINE CORPS

##### To be second lieutenants

Arthur J. Barrett  
Hudson E. Bridge  
William J. Dickinson  
Howard E. Wertman  
Joseph E. DeSoucey  
William H. McDaniel  
Herbert F. Breeden  
Robert M. Ervin  
Thomas M. Kerr, Jr.

James C. Norris, Jr.  
Ross T. Dwyer, Jr.  
Harrison B. Rue  
Samuel A. Hannah  
Hurley E. Fuller, Jr.  
James F. McInteer, Jr.  
Samuel Jaskilka  
John A. Lindsay

Charles G. Haskins  
Robert W. Powers  
Ronald W. Davis  
Rex E. Walker  
Frank H. Haigler, Jr.  
George E. Kittredge, Jr.  
Josiah W. Bill  
David R. Miller  
"A" "G" Savell  
John J. Aubuchon  
Gordon A. Stallings  
Tom S. Parker  
Maurice E. Flynn  
Paul L. Allen  
Robert D. Metzger  
Ernest C. Bennett

Eugene H. Haffey  
James H. Pope  
Don W. Galbreath  
Theodore A. McKay  
William T. Westmoreland, Jr.  
Mitchell O. Sadler  
Raymond J. Fening  
Charles A. Chapin  
Laurence L. Scott  
Charles L. McNeil  
William R. West  
Ephraim Kirby-Smith  
Lee F. Bennett  
Thomas Parran, Jr.

#### POSTMASTERS

##### CONNECTICUT

Timothy J. Sullivan, New London.  
Edward A. Bowes, Saybrook.  
Thomas P. Horan, South Norwalk.  
Arthur J. Caisse, South Willington.  
Emanuel Kurtz, Trumbull.

##### DELAWARE

Zora B. Tatman, Frederica.

##### GEORGIA

Joseph T. Bohannon, Grantville.  
Sarah Short Barnett, Leary.  
Farris K. Mize, West Point.

##### IDAHO

Donald E. Springer, Headquarters.

##### INDIANA

Heber A. Loyce, Lowell.  
Dale E. Hughes, Perryville.  
Nelson H. Minthorn, Royal Center.  
Iver C. Bain, Russellville.  
Hugo J. Thalmann, Union Mills.

##### KANSAS

Beulah H. Stewart, Baldwin City.

##### KENTUCKY

Wilcie Brandenburg, Booneville.  
Rebecca B. Forsythe, Greenup.  
Ezra C. Williams, Russell.  
Emma K. Riley, Sparta.  
Leta W. Hobbs, Woodburn.

##### LOUISIANA

James L. Treadway, Alexandria.  
Mildred M. Gleason, Belcher.  
William S. Montgomery, Saline.

##### MINNESOTA

Esther E. Flynn, Westbrook.

##### MONTANA

Harry H. Howard, Bozeman.  
Glen Mace Cox, Shelby.

##### NEW MEXICO

Ray S. Soladay, Carlsbad.  
James A. Walsh, Central.

##### VERMONT

Clarence J. Coon, Bomoseen.  
Anson S. Hawkins, South Shaftsbury.  
Bernis H. Snyder, Townshend.

##### VIRGINIA

Otho H. Brewbaker, Buchanan.  
Albin O. Haley, Front Royal.

##### WEST VIRGINIA

Edwin Caperton, Alloy.  
Lois E. Henderson, Osage.  
Myrtle Blackman, Parsons.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 1, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.  
The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art not far away, we pray for the emancipation of everything which